

**NATIONALISM AND HISTORIOGRAPHY:
THE CASE OF NINETEENTH-CENTURY
LITHUANIAN HISTORICISM**

Virgil Krapauskas

**EAST EUROPEAN MONOGRAPHS, BOULDER
DISTRIBUTED BY COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS, NEW YORK
2000**

EAST EUROPEAN MONOGRAPHS, No. DLIX

Copyright 2000 by Virgil Krapauskas

ISBN 0-88033-457-6

Library of Congress Control Number 00-133030

Printed in the United States of America

For Anna-Jean

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	vii
I. Introduction	1
II. Identity Problems	7
III. Sources and Influences	25
IV. The Lithuanistics Movement: Approaching a Modern Concept of Lithuania	45
V. The World of Simonas Daukantas and the Beginnings of Lithuanian Historicism	63
VI. Two Scientific Historians	87
VII. The Historiography of <i>Auszra</i> and the <i>Aušrininkai</i>	107
VIII. Catholics and Liberals	151
IX. Conclusion	189
Bibliographic Essay	199
Bibliography	207
Index	231

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In the process of writing this, my first book, I am particularly indebted to the members of my dissertation committee, especially Professors John Kulczycki, Edward Thaden and David Fainhauz. Although not a member of my committee, Professor Giedrius Subačius of the University of Illinois at Chicago read my manuscript and made constructive suggestions. I am especially grateful to Mr. Jonas Dainauskas for the use of his large private library. The conversations we had in his living room always provided me with insights and information. Mr. Vytautas Šliūpas, the son of one of "my historians," also provided me with invaluable material from his archive on Jonas Šliūpas. Special thanks go to Professor Jonas Račkauskas of the Lithuanian Research and Studies Center in Chicago and Sister Perpetua of the Sisters of St. Casimir for the use of their libraries.

In Lithuania Mr. Albinas Valinskas helped me navigate the corridors of the University of Vilnius Library. Besides giving me books from the foreign exchange department of the library, he gave me access to and photocopies of everything I asked for. Dr. Vilma Žaltauskaitė and Dr. Darius Staliūnas of the Lithuanian History Institute in Vilnius, and Dr. Vytautas Berenis of the Lithuanian Cultural and Art Institute read my manuscript and made many valuable recommendations.

I

INTRODUCTION

*At this point the Suevic sea, on its eastern shore,
washes the tribes of the Aestii, whose rites and
fashions and style of dress are those of the Suevi.*

TACITUS

HISTORICISM

The nineteenth century was the age of historicism. Philosophers and historians with various agendas have defined historicism differently. Influenced by the physical sciences and the industrial revolution the rise of historicism coincided with the rise of nationalism. A reaction to the Age of the Enlightenment, historicism accepted the dictates of science, but also elevated the status of the individual. Maurice Mandelbaum has proposed an impartial definition of historicism. "Historicism is the belief that an adequate understanding of the nature of anything and an adequate assessment of its value are to be gained by considering it in terms of the place it occupied and the role it played within a process of development."¹ The term historicism came into use before World War I and became popular during the inter-war era under the influence of philosopher historians such as Friedrich Meinecke, Wilhelm Dilthey, Johann Droysen, Benedetto Croce, and others. Although some have seen historicism as a German phenomena, it also appeared in Lithuania by way of Poland, as will be seen.

Earlier writers of history often saw ancillary field like ethnology, archeology and philology as synonymous with history. Especially under the influence of Romantic nationalism, historians often included mythical accounts of the origins of their particular nation or people. It was a rare Romantic Nationalist who did not want to draw a connection between his own nation and the Ancient Greeks, Romans or even the earliest Indo-Europeans. The activists of the Lithuanian national rebirth were no different. However, even the most naive and amateurish of Lithuanian nationalists understood that if they were to be taken

seriously, they needed to become more “scientific.” Historicism had shown them how to think about human beings beyond the narrow scope of religious, national or racial prejudices. If the amateur historians of the nineteenth-century Lithuanian national rebirth often failed to produce works of lasting scholarly value, they at least understood in what direction they should go. They wanted to write critical histories but their nationalism often hampered their good sense. In this way Lithuanian historians were no different from their more “advanced” colleagues in Western Europe. Historicism mediated between the prejudices of nationalism and the dispassion of historical research.

Possibly the first presentation of historicism was by Giambattista Vico with his book *The New Science* in the eighteenth century. This book proposed new fields of study, the human sciences. Vico’s advancement of the human sciences gave a method for dealing with history as a source of knowledge. Instead of explaining history in religious terms or simply as contemporary events, historians began to look at human history as a distinct area of knowledge separate from myth or poetry. Especially under the influence of the new human sciences such as sociology, historians like Leopold von Ranke began to see history as an independent discipline based on the interpretation of written records. By the nineteenth century historians began to professionalize the study of history. They collected documents, interpreted them critically and tried to analyze them objectively.

Later in the nineteenth century, under the influence of positivism, historians made historical research even more critical and scientific, but for the positivists history also had to be practical. Chapter Seven will deal with the influences of positivism on Lithuanian historiography. History had to meet the educational and nationalist needs of the people. Studying history would even educate those who had not been traditionally educated such as the peasantry. Historicism and later positivism gave us a methodology for analyzing primary sources, for using common sense, and overall for aspiring to objectivity.

Historicism required the historian to “get into the skin” of the historical character. Using their imaginations when documents were unavailable, the activists of the Lithuanian national rebirth interpreted history in ways favorable to their nationalist cause. As will be seen, many Lithuanian writers of the nineteenth century wrote history from within. In other words, because they knew the Lithuanian language

and had Lithuanian “feelings,” they believed that they were the only ones who could sufficiently understand Lithuania’s past. As subjective as this may seem, modern historians such as R.G. Collingwood in his *The Idea of History* have espoused the idea of “empathy” as the only way of being in touch with the historical agent.² In fact the activists of the Lithuanian national rebirth grappled with many of the same trends one finds in twentieth-century historiography and the philosophy of history. Although one can find virtually every idea of the late twentieth-century postmodern historiographical world in nineteenth-century Lithuanian historiography, the amateurs of the Lithuanian national rebirth were trying to do something more basic than engage in a philosophical discourse on historical interpretations. They were trying to reconstruct what had happened.

Historiography here means historical writing in the broadest sense. This study will analyze the role played by the amateur historians of the Lithuanian national rebirth in developing a national identity separate from the Poles. Lithuanian activists often did not differentiate between history and other academic disciplines like ethnology, mythology, archeology and philology.³ The activists of the Lithuanian national rebirth were developing a historical consciousness within an interdisciplinary arena. Partly because they were unable to do so, the activists of the Lithuanian national rebirth did not research their past scientifically as much as present a distinctly Lithuanian history. They were doing the best they could with the limited resources they had. In an attempt to analyze the historiography of modern Lithuania I will take a “second look” at the activists of the Lithuanian national rebirth and relate how they used history for nationalist purposes. This study will show that although relatively isolated, Lithuania and Lithuanians were nevertheless Europeans participating in the broader intellectual currents of the nineteenth century. And although they did not know the term historicism, they were, under difficult circumstances, advancing the study of their nations past.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The earliest record of the Balts, of whom the Lithuanians were one tribe, dates from the Roman historian Tacitus in the second century A.D., and although chroniclers mention Lithuania as early as

the ninth and tenth centuries, only the thirteenth century gives us anything resembling an accurate picture of Lithuania. To a greater degree than with other nations, foreigners wrote much of Lithuania's history. Chapter Two of this study presents a survey of Lithuania's historiography written in languages other than Lithuanian.

In the thirteenth century the Teutonic Knights conquered and Germanized the Old Prussians who were one of the Baltic tribes. Organized during the Crusades, the Teutonic Knights were primarily a German monastic and military order that fought infidels in the Middle East and the Baltics. The "Saracens of the North," as the Teutonic Knights called the Balts, struggled for more than one hundred and fifty years against the Order. During that time the Order conquered all of the Balts except the Lithuanians. Paradoxically, military pressure from the Teutonic Knights helped the Lithuanians to consolidate into a military state. Though decentralized, Lithuania became the largest and most powerful Eastern European state by the fifteenth century.

Out of the shroud of Lithuanian legends comes the first historical ruler of Lithuania Mindaugas (Pol.: Mindowca ca. 1200-1263). Having murdered his brothers and nephews, Mindaugas became the supreme leader and founder of the Lithuanian state. Pressured by a war with the Knights of the Sword,⁴ by an uprising led by his uncle, and by a war with Volynia, Mindaugas negotiated for peace with the Livonian Order by promising to accept Christianity. On authority of Pope Innocent IV, Mindaugas became a Christian, and in 1251 he was crowned King of Lithuania. The circumstances surrounding his subsequent apostasy and murder remain unclear. Lithuanian historians have often emphasized Mindaugas's christening over the official christening of Lithuania in 1386.

Following Mindaugas's death, the Lithuanian Grand Dukes expanded their territory into East Slavic territories and managed to contain the Teutonic Knights. Founded by Gediminas (Pol.: Giedymin, 1275-1341) the Gediminid Dynasty ushered in the period of Lithuania's greatest military and political power. Ruthless and violent the five greatest rulers of the dynasty were Gediminas, his two sons Algirdas (Pol.: Olgiard, 1300-1377) and Kęstutis (Pol.: Kiejstut, 1297-1382), who established a diarchy, and their respective sons Jogaila (Pol.: Jagiełło, 1350-1434) and Vytautas (Pol.: Witold 1350-1430).

Unable to continue the diarchy established by Algirdas and Kęstutis after Algirdas's death Jogaila and Kęstutis struggled for power. After Kęstutis's death,⁵ the two cousins Jogaila and Vytautas vied for power in Lithuania. In a move to strengthen his position against Vytautas and the Teutonic Knights, Jogaila accepted the Act of Krewo in 1385 by which he embraced Christianity, married Queen Jadwiga of Poland, and became the King of Poland. The power struggle between Jogaila and Vytautas produced the most dramatic chapter in Lithuania's history. Although a vassal of Jogaila, Vytautas would eventually rule as an independent Grand Duke of Lithuania, bringing Lithuania to the pinnacle of power. Vytautas is the only person in Lithuanian history with the title "the Great." Among the naive Lithuanian nationalists, Jogaila having become identified with Poland, became a Lithuanian traitor. Nevertheless these two cousins reconciled enough to defeat the Teutonic Knights in one of the most mythologized battles of the Middle Ages, the Battle of Grunwald in 1410. For all of his independence and his association with Lithuania, Vytautas died without heirs, meaning that the tenuous relationship that the Poles and the Lithuanians had established with the Act of Krewo continued after the deaths of the two famous cousins. After Vytautas's death the Jogaila branch of the dynasty in effect changed the Gediminids into the Jagiellonians. With the death of Sigismund Augustus in 1572 the Gediminid and Jagiellonian dynasties ended. Lithuanian historians have often stressed that the Jagiellonians caused Lithuania's ruin, whereas the Gediminids brought Lithuania to its heights.

Although the two states remained independent, Lithuania's fate increasingly became tied to Poland's fate, so that in 1569 at Lublin the personal union that had started with Jadwiga and Jogaila changed to a formal union of the two states, though the two countries maintained separate armies, law courts, finances and state seals. Although legally the two nations did not create a single state, for modern Lithuanian nationalists the tragic aspect of the union came in the form of Polonization. Many Lithuanian magnates and later Lithuanian historians went to great lengths to show their independence of Poland, but increasingly the elite culture of Lithuania became Polish.

In the late eighteenth century, Lithuania shared the same political fate as Poland in the three partitions of 1772, 1793, and 1795. After

the three partitions and the Napoleonic wars, Russification slowly began to replace Polonization in Lithuania. Whereas Polonization had not been coercive, Russification was. During the nineteenth century Lithuanian linguistic and cultural fortunes came to such a low ebb that the language and culture of Lithuania were threatened with extinction. Only the most backward peasants and the petty nobility of the western regions of Lithuania still used the Lithuanian language. Lithuanians were so inconsequential that the Russians considered the national struggle to be between themselves and the Poles. In an attempt to crack the domination of the Poles in Lithuanian, the Russians closed Vilnius University. After two unsuccessful insurrections, one in 1831, the other in 1863, Polish influence began to wane. Another factor in Lithuania's demise was the Russian government's prohibition against the printing of Lithuanian books and newspapers in the Latin alphabet. The press ban which lasted from 1865 to 1904 elicited a nationalist reaction among the nascent Lithuanian intelligentsia. This period loosely coincides with the Lithuanian national rebirth. Believing they had a historical imperative to do so, the activists of the Lithuanian nation rebirth saved their language, history and culture from extinction.

NOTES

1. Paul Edward, ed. *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (New York: Macmillan, 1967), s. v. "Historicism," by Maurice Mandelbaum.

2. R. G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

3. In eighteenth-century Germany, philology was virtually identical to the study of history.

4. Often called the Livonian Order, they eventually merged with the Teutonic Knights.

5. Jogaila imprisoned Kęstutis and his son Vytautas. After five days Kęstutis died under mysterious circumstances while Vytautas escaped and fled to the Teutonic Knights seeking their help against Jogaila.

II

IDENTITY PROBLEMS

Nationalism is, no doubt, the most powerful force in modern history, and it is scarcely surprising that it should have captured historiography and enslaved historians.

HENRY STEELE COMMANGER

When Lithuania declared its independence in 1918, much of the Lithuanian intelligentsia believed that they had inherited the legacy of the medieval Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The creation of a Lithuanian history in the nineteenth century provided the foundation for this belief. They believed that history and language linked them to their past. Before the late nineteenth century, the elite culture of Lithuania had been primarily Polish. In fact, with the Union of Krewo in 1385 and then the Union of Lublin in 1569, Lithuania and Poland established a political and cultural marriage in which Lithuania's history became subsumed into Poland's. A specifically Lithuanian history provided the Lithuanian intelligentsia with an emotional and ideological tool for separating and differentiating themselves from the Poles.

Lithuania required a historical basis for its creation as an independent nation. During the second half of the nineteenth century, an ethnolinguistic Lithuanian intelligentsia of peasant origin began to appear. They needed to prove to themselves that they had a worthwhile and noble past. By inflating the importance of Lithuania's history, the intelligentsia could justify their own aspirations for nationhood and their own sense of self-importance. Their preoccupation with a search for origins and the linguistic beginnings of Lithuania helped activists to accomplish this inflation. They used history to create a historical consciousness which in turn promoted the development of a national identity leading eventually to the establishment of the modern Lithuanian nation, which differed from the old Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

Philosophers and historians have written much about the separate issues of a Lithuanian national identity and the Lithuanian national

rebirth, but this is the first study that combines national identity with historiography.¹ Within the confines of Lithuanian historiography one can find the progress of the Lithuanian national rebirth and the formation of a clear national identity. This study will examine the relationship of nationalism and the study of history in the context of the nineteenth-century Lithuanian national rebirth. In one respect it is an inquiry into how historians contributed to the development of a Lithuanian national identity. It is also a study of how historical consciousness furnishes the intellectual rationale for nation-building.²

History is a psychological component in nation building. In order to build a nation one must have hope in the future, but the future rests on the past. A nationalist history gave hope to the rising expectations of the Lithuanian intelligentsia:

Nationalism promises a 'status reversal,' where the last shall be first and the world will recognize the chosen people and their sacred values. This is where ethno-history is so vital. Not only must the nation boast a distant past on which to base its promise of immortality: it must be able to unfold a glorious past, a golden age of saints and heroes, to give meaning to its promise of restoration and dignity.... The felt antiquity of a community's ethno-history, irrespective of its truth-content, as nationalists have long understood, is the criterion of national dignity and the bar at which they must make their appeal for national restoration.³

Nationalism furthers the cause of national identity but not the cause of historical science. Anthony D. Smith cites cases in Finnish and Irish history where the recovery of an ancient but apparently "lost" history restores to the lower classes a sense that they once had a "high" culture.⁴ Socioeconomic and linguistic factors may precede the development of a historical consciousness, but history is no less important in the development of a national identity.

Another ingredient closely tied to the development of a national history is the development of a national myth. Unlike the Estonians with their *Kalevipoeg*⁵ and the Latvians with their *Lāčplēsis*,⁶ the Lithuanians do not have a national epic.⁷ Because a Lithuanian medieval military state with its own history had existed in the past, Lithuanian activists could search for their national identity in history. Because much of that past was unknown, Lithuanian writers mixed

folklore, history, and myth freely. Nineteenth century Polish language writers like Adam Mickiewicz, Juliusz Słowacki, Ignacy Kraszewski, and Ludwik Kondratowicz increasingly took themes from Lithuanian history and mythology, but they understood Lithuania in the context of the old Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth which existed from the union of the two countries until 1795, rather than as a nation separate from Poland. They considered themselves Poles and citizens of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Yet, these Poles felt that it was time that the Lithuanians should start writing their own history instead of having Germans, Russians, or Poles distort Lithuania's history. As nations become more secular, the discipline of history replaces myth, yet myths often perpetuate themselves in history.

As small as it was, the Lithuanian intelligentsia laid the intellectual foundations of the Lithuanian nation. According to Smith the role of the intelligentsia is "to mobilize a formerly passive community into forming a nation around the new vernacular historical culture that it has rediscovered."⁸ He continues:

...nationalists rediscovered and often exaggerated the heroism of past ages, the glories of ancestral civilizations (often not 'their own') and the exploits of their great national heroes, even when those heroes belonged more to the realm of legend than history and, if they lived, knew nothing of the nation which was so busy reclaiming them from obscurity.⁹

Perceptions of Lithuanian history are the issue here, not the objective reality of the historical record. In another respect this study is an example of how nationalists use and abuse history and how historians project their own biases onto the past. Although it is virtually impossible to judge how the reading of a nationally biased history influenced the growth of Lithuanian nationalism, some have claimed that "...questions dealing with the nation's past took first place in the nineteenth century Lithuanian national renaissance."¹⁰ History obsessed the activists of the Lithuanian national rebirth. However, other than a few testimonials by Lithuanian activists that history determined their outlook on national identity, assessing the role that history plays in fostering nationalism would be difficult. Nevertheless, the very supposition of the existence of a nation as a concrete entity presupposes it has an identifiable past. Indeed, the

development of a national historiography seems to be central to a national awakening. To assert the existence of Lithuania, the activists of the Lithuanian national rebirth had to create a past.

The question arises whether Lithuania even had its own history. Roman Dmowski¹¹ did not consider Lithuania a historical nation. It had not matured enough to be worthy of freedom and independence.¹² Anatol Lieven takes a different view: "Most of the books called 'A History of Lithuania' or 'A History of Poland' are nothing of the kind."¹³ They are the histories of multi-ethnic and multi-linguistic states whose history from the Act of Krewo in 1385 to the establishment of separate and independent states in 1918 were the history of one state—the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

Searching for a Lithuanian national identity in historiography is directly related to looking for the Lithuanian national rebirth. The irony of the term the "Lithuanian national rebirth" is that it was not a rebirth but rather the birth of a new nation that still maintained historical ties with the multilingual Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The origins of a Lithuanian national identity go back to the Middle Ages. However, people living in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania did not have a modern sense of nationality. They either had a religious, regional, or an estate identity. But language did not play a major role in identity. This undeniable fact was not acceptable to the activists of the Lithuanian national rebirth, who believed that the defining marker of national identity had to be language. They therefore combed the earliest Lithuanian written records for any encouraging evidence of a sense of national identity. They faced a daunting task. In 1547 a Lutheran pastor, Martynas Mažvydas (?-1563), published the first Lithuanian language book, a catechism in Königsberg. Starting with Mažvydas and Mikołaj Dauksza (1527-1613), who translated Polish Catechisms for Lithuanian Catholics, we have a host of writers—Stanisław Rapegelonis (1485-1545), Abraham Kulwieć (?-1545), and many others who produced a significant quantity of religious literature written in Lithuanian. There is, however, no sign of a national identity in these religious works, which were initially intended for distribution among the literate faithful. Nevertheless, in the introduction to his *Postilla Catholica*, Dauksza called for the natural rights of Lithuanians to use their own language in all walks of life.¹⁴ Although

Dauksza's statements may have actually reflected only a concern about ethnicity, the nineteenth-century Lithuanian activists found in Dauksza what they needed—a historic call for use of the Lithuanian language, which they interpreted as a matter of national self-definition.

Nineteenth-century Lithuania had inherited the legacy of the union between Poland and Lithuania that began with the Act of Krewo in 1385 and which was finalized in the Union of Lublin in 1569. This union created a symbiotic political and cultural relationship between Poland and Lithuania, so much so that it became difficult in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to differentiate between the two nations. The Polish language poet Adam Mickiewicz wrote that "God had graced Poland by having such a large nation as Lithuania unite with Poland as a husband and wife join, two souls in one body."¹⁵ However, in his epic poem *Konrad Wallenrod* Mickiewicz had relegated Lithuania to the distant past. Likewise the Polish-language historian Teodor Narbutt ended his nine-volume *Dzieje narodu litewskiego* [History of the Lithuanian Nation] at the date 1569 because he thought that Lithuania had ceased to exist with the Union of Lublin. A linguistic Lithuanian like Daukantas understood Lithuania and its history differently from the Lithuanians of Polish culture.

After the Union of Lublin, though Poland and Lithuania maintained separate legal and political institutions, the Lithuanian boyars¹⁶ became Polonized. Unlike the Germans in the Baltic provinces who had initially been colonists in these areas, these Polonized Lithuanians were indigenous to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. In spite of their Polish culture and language they often held separatist political views. After the partitions the Polonized Lithuanian szlachta maintained their leadership in cultural affairs. Many of the Polonized Lithuanians considered themselves the real Lithuanians, while the peasants who only spoke Lithuanian or the Samogitian dialects were merely using the "muzhik"¹⁷ language. Józef Piłsudski may be the best example of a native of eastern Lithuania who felt that the Lithuanians were really Poles. The people who did not have such feelings were disloyal Samogitian peasants, who were playing into the hands of the Russians. Such twentieth-century feelings interfere with an understanding of early nineteenth-century national identity. Whereas the

process of Polonization had less influence on the peasantry of Samogitia, the influence of the large estates of eastern Lithuania made the region, a part of Poland in practice, linguistically, culturally, and even emotionally, though administratively these western gubernii were a part of the Russian empire. Because of the process of Polonization, by the mid-eighteenth century the Lithuanian language had almost disappeared among the elites. Linguists like Kossakowski and Watson even predicted that the Lithuanian language would die out in a hundred years much like the old Prussian language which had disappeared in the Middle Ages.¹⁸ As literacy spread, Polonization intensified even among the peasants.

The Polonization of the Lithuanian szlachta eventually created one joint political nation—the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Hence, historians from a variety of backgrounds looked upon Lithuania as a part of Poland. They often considered Lithuanian history a regional Polish affair and not something set apart from Poland's past. Nevertheless, many Polonized Lithuanians made a distinction between the Poles from the kingdom of Poland and themselves. Daukantas went further by writing about the linguistic Lithuanians as native Lithuanians [*rodowity litwin*], whereas those Lithuanians who spoke only Polish, he regarded simply as Poles of Lithuanian descent.

The problem with differentiating among various labels like linguistic Lithuanian, Polish-Lithuanian, or Pole is that these groups could and often used the same terminology in describing themselves and their feelings about Lithuania. A Lithuanian, a Samogitian, a Pole, and a Belarusin could and did regard themselves as the real Lithuanians. Maybe a person of German origin like Lelewel was a "real Pole," but Vilnius's intellectual celebrities like the historians Narbutt, Onacewicz, Daniłowicz, and writers and poets like Kraszewski and Mickiewicz, expressed their love for Lithuania's history and its Grand Dukes: Gediminas, Kęstutis, and Vytautas. And whereas the Lithuanian language was a matter of indifference for them, Lithuania's history was the history of their fatherland [*ojczyzna*]. In contrast to the Polonized Lithuanian szlachta, the nineteenth-century Lithuanian intelligentsia believed that the Lithuanian peasantry embodied the nation. But even here geography, religion, culture, and history as well as resistance to tsarist rule united the Poles of the Congress Kingdom, the Polonized Lithuanians of the western gubernii¹⁹ and the

Lithuanian peasantry. Language was a marker of social class but class did not yet act as a centrifugal force separating these three groups. Polish was the literary language while the spoken language of lord and peasant was an unimportant distinguishing factor in their joint resistance to Russian rule. For example, the Samogitian peasants joined the 1831²⁰ insurrection and sang, "Poland is not lost so long as the Samogitians live."²¹

Prior to the nineteenth century neither Poles nor Lithuanians had a modern sense of nationality. Although initially the confusion of languages, geography, genealogy, and ethnicity presented few problems, with the dawn of the Lithuanian national rebirth of the late nineteenth century, national identity came to be based on ethnicity and history. In the early nineteenth century when a person's national identity was not yet a priority, saying that someone like Adam Mickiewicz was either a Lithuanian or a Pole in the modern sense would be anachronistic. Many people of eastern Lithuania were Polish Lithuanians, and the centrifugal forces that eventually separated Poles from Lithuanian developed slowly. The local residents of Lithuania often spoke a patois that was neither Polish nor Lithuanian nor Belarusin. Language could not determine a person's national identity. Geography is also not a precise tool in ascertaining nationality. One must remember that according to today's boundaries Mickiewicz, Kościuszko, and many other Poles were born in Lithuania, Belarus, or Ukraine. Likewise, a family such as the Czartoryski considered itself genealogically Gediminaitis [of the Gediminas; Pol.: Gedyminid], that is belonging to a Lithuanian dynasty of medieval Grand Dukes whose lineage was older than the Romanovs or the Jagiellonians. Even a personal declaration of belonging to one nationality or another is misleading. For instance, Mickiewicz's dictum of "*gentes Lituani nationes Polonii*," while intelligible in the nineteenth century, was essentially inaccurate. Lithuanians were not a tribe, and in a time before modern Polish nationalism, Mickiewicz was not nationalist. Often writers would use the labels Lithuanian and Pole interchangeably. Polish landlords and Lithuanian peasants could without any problem have a regional identity as Lithuanians. Chroniclers and historians like Strykowski and Narbutt made nationality synonymous with being a subject in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Because nationality was not an issue for them, they had no notion of denation-

alization. Confusing the issue further, authors like Ignacy Kraszewski, Teodor Narbutt, and even the twentieth-century writer Czesław Miłosz could consider themselves Lithuanians who created a branch of Lithuanian literature in the Polish language, just as later, twentieth-century Lithuanians would consider these Polish language writers to be their fellow Lithuanians who happened to live in a time when Polish was the literary language of the Lithuanians.²² Such as it was, the Lithuanian language and peasant culture survived in this milieu of Polish cultural influences. By the second half of the nineteenth century a rift had emerged between the Lithuanian elites of Polish culture and the Lithuanian intelligentsia as to who would define what a Lithuanian was. The Poles of eastern Lithuania staked out a position that later was unacceptable to Lithuanian nationalists. This intellectual rift ended in an ethnic and national division of what had previously been one people.

Imposing twentieth-century notions of national identity on nineteenth-century individuals is a useless exercise. Whether the activists of the nineteenth century wrote in Polish or in Lithuanian they had their own identities. By today's standard an individual could be placed on a spectrum of nationality. A person could be more or less Lithuanian. He might be, "a little bit Polish, a little bit German, a little bit Lithuanian but first of all a Catholic."²³ Actually there were more variations. Often people of the nineteenth century would not differentiate between Russians and Belarusins. Poles sometimes claimed that the Belarusins were peasants who spoke a Polish dialect. Most labels seem inadequate to describe the identity of the people living in what used to be the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Saying that a nineteenth century person did not have our national sensibilities is only begging the question. What did a person who spoke only Polish but said he was Lithuanian mean?

By the nineteenth century, the upper classes no longer used the Lithuanian language. As class divisions became apparent, only the petty szlachta of Samogitia²⁴ still used a dialect of Lithuanian. For many Lithuanian activists the preservation of the language became an important step in the struggle for survival and cultural identity. It made a difference to the activists of the Lithuanian national rebirth that writers like Daukantas and Valančius wrote their histories in the Lithuanian language, for nationalists wanted the message of Lithua-

nian history delivered in that language. In the early nineteenth century individual activists of the Lithuanian movement still used Polish more often than Lithuanian, but by the late nineteenth century, Lithuanian nationalists wanted the "right" interpretation written in the "right" language.

In the early nineteenth century there was no evidence of antagonism between Poles and Lithuanians. For a clear expression of national identity we must jump to 1883 and the appearance of the first nationalist Lithuanian language newspaper *Auszra*. Only later during *Aušros Gadynė* (the *Auszra* epoch, 1883-1886) did Lithuanians invent the idea of Polish national oppression. To be sure, during *Aušros Gadynė* national antagonisms were tied to class differences as well, but before 1883 the arguments of individuals like Daukantas had their basis in disagreements over language and historical interpretation rather than class conflict. Earlier Lithuanian separatists like the Radziwiłłs²⁵ had dynastic feudal agendas; they were not Lithuanian nationalists.

This study will pay special attention to the anti-Polish character of Lithuanian historiography, which stemmed from the broader antagonisms between Poles and Lithuanians. Lithuanian culture was never Polish culture nor did it become Polish. For historical, religious, and social reasons, Poland influenced Lithuania more than its other neighbors; nevertheless, one could argue that modern Lithuanian culture is a melting pot of Polish, German, and Russian influences. More accurately, the Lithuanian philosopher and pedagogue Stasys Šalkauskis (1886-1941) believed that Lithuania had initially been under the influence of medieval Rus' but in accepting Christianity from the west, Lithuania chose to join the Latinized civilization of the Poles.²⁶

By the nineteenth century Lithuanians could not overthrow Russian rule in Lithuania nor could they influence affairs in Lithuania Minor,²⁷ that part of East Prussia where Lithuanians had been under German influence from the times of the Teutonic Crusades. Instead, they directed their resentment against their perceived social and cultural oppressors, the Poles. Ironically, the Poles themselves were an oppressed nation under Russian rule, who could not bring the weight of a powerful state to force Polonization upon the Lithuanians but were the most accessible, the most politically impotent, and the

most culturally daunting enemy. Germans and Russians were too distant and too powerful for the Lithuanians to deal with. History provides examples of national hatreds between powerless neighbors with similar cultures, and the Polish-Lithuanian case is no exception.

Salkauskis believed that Lithuania, which had been such a large and powerful state in the Middle Ages, did not contribute to world civilization because the Lithuanian nation had split into two parts, the enlightened but Polonized upper classes and the peasantry.²⁸ Two Lithuanian cultures existed side by side in the nineteenth century.²⁹ The peasants who spoke Lithuanian had no notion of a national identity and cared little about the history of what seemed like a different people. The Lithuanian szlachta, on the other hand, although thoroughly Polonized, had its own individuality, shaped by Lithuania's history.³⁰ Spurred on by the Lithuanian szlachta's interest in finding their roots, historians like Teodor Narbutt and Ignacy Onacewicz began to write an idealized version of Lithuania's history in the early nineteenth century. It was the history of a state without a modern national identity. Because of their Polish culture, these historians relegated the Lithuanian szlachta of eastern Lithuania to the Polish side of the Polish-Lithuanian divide. But the Polonized Lithuanian szlachta often insisted on their Lithuanian national identity even if in the Polish language.

The nineteenth century was also the Age of Romanticism. Lithuanian historians use the term Romanticism as a word that needs little explanation. Obviously, Romanticism cannot define all of Lithuanian historiography. Yet other countries have had historiographic Renaissances, Reformations, and Enlightenments, whereas Lithuanian historiography started with the nineteenth century Age of Romanticism and never fully emerged from the "diapers of Polish Romanticism."³¹ This romanticized history could at times be compatible with Polish history, thus complicating the delineation of the Lithuanian contours of the movement.

Nineteenth century Lithuanian Romanticism was a literary movement within which history formed an integral part. Its origins were the same as those of Western European Romanticism. Lithuanian Romanticism had its first flowering during the first three decades of the University of Vilnius (1803-1832). Romantic historians like Simonas Daukantas, writing in Lithuanian, and Teodor Narbutt,

writing in Polish, produced idealized versions of Lithuania's past, accentuating the heroics of medieval Grand Dukes and theorizing about the origins of the Lithuanians. In addition to their preoccupation with pagan Lithuania, the Romantics also emphasized the role of the peasantry as the guardians of the nation's culture. This idea rooted national identity to the masses.

Romantic historicism did not create a philosophy so much as foster a variety of cultural insights, "...that poetry does not merely lie, that mythology may be (as Herder said) the 'oldest history,' that imagination is a portal to a kind of historical truth not accessible to pure reason."³² Often the Romantic writers would accept myths and legends at face value. Although reacting to the rationalism of the age of the Enlightenment, the Romantics like Daukantas had access to Western erudition and the latest findings in the sciences; and they were aware of a critical approach to researching the past. Nevertheless, the Romantics preferred to use any material that would instill in their readers an awe of Lithuania's prehistoric and medieval past. They chose to use an intuitive approach to history whereby they believed they could understand the heroic deeds of their forefathers from within. One had to have the "correct" feeling about one's own past. Only an insider, someone who lived in Lithuania, spoke Lithuanian, and had a Lithuanian perspective, could understand Lithuania. They could imagine history "*wie es eigentlich gewesen*."³³ Especially in the late nineteenth century, Lithuanian writers often regarded dispassionate scholarship that disparaged the cultural level of Lithuania's history as foreign prejudice.

Although Polish history, mythology, and poetry influenced the new Lithuanian activists, the Lithuanians simultaneously rebelled against but nonetheless used Polish sources. They decided that the Lithuanian language, nation, and history were alive and that they were not merely Polish peasants who spoke Lithuanian. They also made Lithuania's history into a very personal matter. Rather than an interest in dispassionate scholarship, one often finds in their writings a concern for a nationally conscious history—"Our History."

During the formative years of Lithuanian historiography, a powerful but mythical version of Lithuanian history emerged. It was a romantic conception of history that used Poland as its foil. If Polish history considered the Union of Kiewo and the Jagiellonian dynasty

positively, then Lithuanians considered them historical tragedies. If the Union of Lublin in 1569 had created the "brotherhood of two nations," then Lithuanians thought the Union was a national disaster. Poles had Christianized Lithuania and introduced it to Western culture, whereas the Lithuanians perceived Christianization as a violation of their language and culture, and eventually as a tool with which to Polonize Lithuania. The characters of Vytautas and Jogaila are a litmus test for Polish and Lithuanian history. Both were Lithuanian Grand Dukes, but Jogaila became the king of Poland. Lithuanian history refers to Vytautas the Great, whereas Jogaila was Lithuania's greatest traitor. Simply put, if a Pole said yes then a Lithuanian had to say no. This rather naive approach was inevitable because the Lithuanian nationalists set out to prove that Lithuania's history was not just a regional history of Poland. They needed to redefine Lithuania's past, which Poles and Polonized Lithuanians had previously defined.

The most important of the Lithuanian Romantic historians was Simonas Daukantas (1793-1864). He wrote the first history of the Lithuanians and Samogitians [*Darbai Senujų Lietuvių ir Žemaičių*] in the Lithuanian language. The father of Lithuanian history romanticized pagan Lithuania and attributed Lithuania's downfall to Polish Christianity. All of Lithuanian historiography falls neatly into the period before and after Daukantas. Before Daukantas the idea of a Lithuanian history separate from Polish history existed but remained ill-defined. Instead of explaining Lithuania's history in the context of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, Daukantas began to write about a nation whose essence the peasantry had preserved. For Daukantas the Lithuanian peasantry would no longer merely signify a social class but rather the Nation and its history. He also wanted to connect Lithuania's medieval greatness to the Lithuanian peasants of the nineteenth century. Much like Ernest Renan, Daukantas believed that, "We are what you were; we will be what you are."³⁴ History could explain the reasons for Lithuania's downfall or it might point the way to the future.

Daukantas received his training at the University of Vilnius, but in the wake of the 1831 insurrection, the Russians closed the University of Vilnius in 1832. This retarded the development of Lithuanian historiography, and it delayed all areas of Lithuanian cultural development. Between 1832 and the start of the twentieth century Lithuania

did not produce any professionally trained historians. In fact, until the 1860's the intelligentsia who spoke Lithuanian lived in a Polish speaking world. Further impeding the development of a national consciousness, or at least seeking to do so, the Russian authorities imposed a ban on Lithuanian publications printed in the Latin alphabet between 1864 and 1904.³⁵ Paradoxically, this forty-year period evoked a national response that coincided with the most active and creative period of the Lithuanian national rebirth.

Perhaps the defining era in the search for a Lithuanian identity started with the illegal publication of the first Lithuanian language newspaper *Auszra* in 1883 and ended with the repeal of the ban on the Lithuanian press in 1904. Although the Lithuanian national rebirth had its intellectual origins with people like Simonas Daukantas and the bishop of Samogitia Motiejus Valančius (1801-1875), it was the *Aušros Gadinė* that created a modern Lithuania identity. This Lithuanian national rebirth³⁶ consciously defined the Lithuanians as separate from the Poles. Earlier, German, Russian, and Polish scholars had begun researching the Lithuanian language, but their concerns were scholarly and antiquarian rather than nationalist. Writers like Mickiewicz, Kondratowicz, and Kraszewski lamented that they did not know enough Lithuanian to write in that language. On the one hand, the Polonized Lithuanian szlachta did not have the same concern with saving the Lithuanian language as the Lithuanian intelligentsia had. On the other hand, the Polonized gentry regarded Lithuania's history as their own. History could validate their lost status as noblemen. In contrast, the Lithuanian intelligentsia of the *Aušros Gadinė* needed history for the creation of a nationalist ideology.

With the advent of *Auszra*, we have the appearance of Lithuanian political and social activists who were enthusiastic amateur historians and who needed to create a heroic past, not an objective history. The modern Polish historian Józef Chlebowski sums up the characteristics of this type of social activist:

Their work and pronouncements are marked by an enthusiasm which draws its life-blood from a one-sided adoration of the past, an uncritical apotheosis of their own ethnic stock and language and their apology, which oscillates between naiveté and megalomania, between ignorance and deliberate distortion of facts....

This is a curious phenomenon; it turns out that romantic visions, wistful dreams and phantasmagoria, including deliberate scientific falsifications, can, from a certain point of view and at a certain stage in the development of newly arising national communities and their ideological bonds, play a positive role.³⁷

One of the main themes in this study is that scholarship and nationalism are essentially incompatible. For the Lithuanian activists, scientific scholarship would lead away from their goal of creating a national identity independent of foreign influences.

Although some of these nonprofessionals were aware of sources and a critical approach to history, many confused mythology with history. They created their own standards in linguistics and archeology, and overall they perpetuated the idealization of Lithuania's past that Daukantas had initiated. They did not care how or why history fostered a national consciousness, because they looked at history from an ideological viewpoint. More so than the scholars of the University of Vilnius, the Lithuanian intelligentsia of *Auszra* and the Lithuanian national rebirth created a history based on ethnicity rather than loyalty to the old Commonwealth. Where Mickiewicz or Narbutt could join the concepts of a Lithuanian and a Pole, the rising Lithuanian intelligentsia began to create a new idea of national identity based on language and history rather than civic loyalty to the old Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

Influenced by such different trends as liberalism and positivism, the father of the Lithuanian national rebirth, Jonas Basanavičius (1851-1927), was a product of Polish Romanticism, which he turned around and used in his historical writings against the Poles. The *Auszra* period produced an abundance of such publicists who wrote about everything from language to farming techniques to history. Historiographically, they were often compilers of previously written histories. They used the works of Kraszewski, Narbutt, Jaroszewicz, and Daukantas, then took whatever they could construe as anti-Polish and wrote their articles and histories perpetuating such myths as Lithuania's Roman origins or the democracy of pagan Lithuania.

In addition to redefining Lithuania's distant past, the activists of the Lithuanian national rebirth had to redefine nineteenth century history. They claimed that in the 1831 and 1863 insurrections the

Lithuanians were heroically fighting for their independence from the Russians, though inevitably that independence would have been within the framework of the old Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Only in the nineteenth century would some Lithuanian historians see a nationalist paradox in these insurrections. Fighting with the Poles against the Russians would mean Polish domination, but fighting against the Poles might further Russification. In any event the Lithuanian nationalists wanted political independence from the Russians and a cultural divorce from the Poles.

NOTES

1. The topic of the Lithuanian national rebirth is too broad for a single study. Lithuanian historians have written monographs on aspects of the rebirth, such as book-smuggling, the temperance movement, illegal schools, and the illegal press.

2. There seems to be wide agreement that developing a national history is only less important than language in defining a nation. Anthony Smith writes, "the historiography of the romantic epoch... provided the moral and intellectual foundation for an emerging nationalism." Anthony D. Smith, "Nationalism and the Historian," in *Ethnicity and Nationalism*, ed. Anthony D. Smith (New York: E. J. Brill), 58. Roman Szporluk concurs that a historical consciousness is part of the nation-forming process. See *Communism and Nationalism: Karl Marx versus Friedrich List* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 157.

3. Anthony Smith, *National Identity* (Reno: University of Nevada, 1991), 161.

4. *Ibid.*, 67.

5. "The Son of Kalev'," published in 1861 by Friedrich Kreuzwald.

6. "The Bear-Tearer," published in 1888 by Andrējs Pumpurs.

7. Some regard Kristijonas Donelaitis's (1714-1780) *Metai* [The Seasons] as a national epic, but it includes no references to Lithuania's medieval and pagan past.

8. Smith, *National Identity*, 64.

9. *Ibid.*, 128.

10. David Fainhauz, "Lietuviai Išeiviai Paryžiuje: Želmens Draugija 1886-1914" [Lithuanians immigrants in Paris: The Želmens Society 1886-1914], *Aidai*, 1, no. 1 (Brooklyn: January 1988): 21-29.

11. A Polish nationalist (1864-1939) and a leader in Poland's struggle for independence.

12. Józef Lewandowski, *Federalizm, Litwa i Białoruś w polityce obozu belwederskiego* [Federalism, Lithuania, and Belarus in the politics of the Belvedere camp] (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawn. Naukowe, 1962), 34.

13. Anatol Lieven, *The Baltic Revolution: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and the Path to Independence* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 131.

14. Mikaloiv Dauksza, "Przedmowa do czytelnika łaskowego" [Preface to the gracious reader], in Jakub Wujek, *Postilla Catholica, Tai est: Iżguldymas Ewangeliiu*

kiekwienos nedelos ir szwętes per wissus metus [Catholic Postil, that is, An Explanation of the Gospels for Every Sunday and Holiday Throughout the Year] trans. Mikaloiv Dauvksza, (Vilnius: Akademios Societatis, 1599. Photographed Kaunas: Lietuvos Universiteto leidinys, 1926).

15. Adam Mickiewicz, *The Book of Our Pilgrimage*, trans. J. K. Tautmyla (Chicago: Draugas Press, 1976), 75-76.

16. The terminology is flexible. One can call this group the Polonized Lithuanian szlachta, or the Lithuanian boyars, or the gentry: they all eventually identified themselves with Poland. Here the term boyar does not refer to the Russian aristocracy but is rather a transliteration of the Lithuanian term "bajoras," which refers to a member of the petty nobility. Because the Lithuanian gentry were Polonized, the term szlachta can also be used as a synonym for boyar. In contrast to the Lithuanian elites of Polish culture, the Lithuanian intelligentsia came from the peasantry, and although Polish culture influenced them, they spoke Lithuanian and they would identify themselves with the Lithuania of 1918.

17. A boorish peasant.

18. Karl Friedrich Watson (1777-1826) pastor and an Enlightenment cultural activist. Jerzy Kossakowski (died 1829). Ignas Jonynas, "Istorijografija Litvy" *Ocherk istorii i istoricheskoi nauki v S.S.R.* (Moscow: 1955), trans. in Ignas Jonynas, *Istorijos Baruose* [In the Field of History], ed. Vytautas Merkys (Vilnius: Mokslas, 1984), 156.

19. After the Second and Third Partitions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the Russians organized the region into nine provinces and the Kingdom of Poland. Ethnic Lithuanians lived in the Kaunas, Vilnius and Suwałki provinces. The Russian authorities considered the western gubernii historically, ethnographically, and religiously Russian and Orthodox. See Theodore R. Weeks, *Nation and State in Late Imperial Russia* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1996), 71.

20. The insurrection first erupted in Poland in November 1830. Because it began later in Lithuania, Lithuanian histories usually refer to it as the 1831 insurrection.

21. Quoted in Piotr S. Wandycz, *The Lands of Partitioned Poland 1795-1918* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1984), 115.

22. Czesław Miłosz, "Vilnius Kaip Dvasinio Gyvenimo Forma" [Vilnius as a Spiritual Form of Life], "Letter to Tomas Venclova 1978," in Tomas Venclova, *Tomas Venclova: Vilties Formos* [Tomas Venclova: The Shapes of Hope] (Vilnius: Spindulio, 1991), 171-184.

23. This quote comes from the *Rigasche Zeitung*, which was commenting on Bishop Edward von Ropp's (1851-1939) removal from his duties as the bishop of Vilnius in 1907 by the Russian authorities for his championing of the Catholic minority within the Russian empire, quoted in Darius Staliūnas, "Truputį Lenkas, Truputį Vokietis, Truputį Lietuvis, o visų Pirma Katalikas," in Egidijus Motieka et al., eds., *Lietuvių Argimimo Istorijos Studijos* [Studies in the History of the Lithuanian Rebirth], vol. 8, *Asmuo: Tarp tautos ir valstybės* [The Individual: Between Nation and State] (Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1996), 271.

24. The Latin name for Žemaitija (Pol.: Zhmud; Eng.: lowlanders), the western part of Lithuania. In their dialect and customs the Samogitians differed significantly from the *Aukštaičiai*—highlanders.

25. One of the most powerful families of magnates in the sixteenth and seventeenth century Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. In the sixteenth century the family opposed

political union with Poland. In the seventeenth-century the Radziwiłłs tried to realign Lithuania with Sweden.

26. Stasys Šalkauskis, "Sur les Confins de deux Mondes," (Geneva: 1919), trans. by author in *Pedagoginiai Raštai* (Kaunas: Šviesa, 1991), 77.

27. The northeastern part of East Prussia inhabited by Lithuanians. It was not part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

28. Šalkauskis, "Sur les Confins de deux Mondes," in *Pedagoginiai Raštai*, 77.

29. The same can be said of Polish society. Jan Ludwik Popławski asserted that the Poles had always been divided into two nations—the historical "nation of the privileged" and the ethnic "nation of the peasantry." See Andrzej Walicki, *Poland Between East and West: The Controversies over Self-Definition and Modernization in Partitioned Poland* (Cambridge: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1994), 37.

30. Michał Römer, *Stosunki etnograficzne-kulturalne na Litwie* [Ethnographic-cultural relations in Lithuania] (Cracow: Krytyka, 1906), 13.

31. Egidijus Aleksandravičius and Antanas Kulakauskas, "Istorijos istorija arba XIXa. Tyrinėjimų apžvalga" [The History of History or a Survey of 19th Century Research], *Akademikas*, 1, no. 3, (Kaunas: January-February 1993): 25.

32. Donald R. Kelley, "Mythistory in the Age of Ranke," in *Leopold von Ranke*, ed. Georg G. Iggers and James M. Powell (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1990), 5.

33. For a more extensive discussion of Romantic historiography see Lionel Gossman, *Between History and Literature* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990), 257-284.

34. Spartan song quoted in Ernest Renan, "Qu'est-ce qu'une nation?" in *Becoming National: A Reader*, eds. Geoff Eley and Ronald Grigor Suny (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 52.

35. The Russian government imposed a ban on the use of what the Lithuanians called the Latin-Polish alphabet. The ban, which lasted from 1864-1904, forbade the publication or importation of Lithuanian books from abroad. The Russians only allowed Lithuanian books printed in the Cyrillic alphabet, called "grazhdanka."

36. Arguably the best summary of the Lithuanian national rebirth is Jerzy Ochmański, *Litewski ruch narodowo-kulturalny w XIX wieku* [The Lithuanian National-Cultural Movement in the 19th Century] (Białystok: Białostockie Towarzystwo Naukowe, 1965).

37. Józef Chlebowczyk, *On Small and Young Nations in Europe* (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1980), 120.

III

SOURCES AND INFLUENCES

Every nation,...has had the same conceit that it before all other nations invented the comforts of human life and that its remembered history goes back to the very beginning of the world.

GIAMBATTISTA VICO

FOREIGN LANGUAGE SOURCES

Ancient classical writers like Strabo and Tacitus mention a tribe called the Aestii, which lived on the southeastern shores of the Baltic Sea. Most likely the Aestii were the prehistoric Balts. Old Prussian, Lithuanian, Lettish, Curonian, Semigallian, and Selian make up the Baltic division of the Indo-Europeans. Much of the information about the prehistoric Balts is fragmentary. Because of a shortage of sources, nineteenth-century authors interested in Lithuanian origins used anything they could to reconstruct a prehistoric past. Questionable classical sources, amateurish archeology, linguistics, and ethnography combined with imagination and national feeling produced a garbled and largely imaginary prehistory of Lithuania. Poor research and faulty logic spawned arcane arguments among nineteenth century writers. Lelewel's, Narbutt's, and Daukantas's speculation about the Herulians and their legitimacy as the prehistoric rulers of Lithuania is an example of just such a debate. By means of arbitrary assertions the Lithuanian intelligentsia wanted to prove that the Slavs and the Germans were not the original rulers of Lithuania. For all of their faults, the professional historians of the University of Vilnius and the amateur historians of the Lithuanian national rebirth began to think differently about Lithuania's history. With the tools of historicism and the feeling of nationalism, they began to create a new history of Lithuania. But before they could create a history, historicism compelled them to research the sources.

The earliest sources that single out Lithuania as a geographic region or military domain are medieval Rus' and Germanic chronicles.¹

The Lithuanian and Old Prussian struggles against the Teutonic Knights produced chronicles such as Peter Dusburg's thirteenth-century *Prussian Chronicles*² and the *Livonian Chronicles*³ by Henry the Latvian (a German from Westphalia) and Herman of Wartberg. While these accounts give us some of the first information about Lithuania, they also present some of the oldest misinformation about Lithuania. Because these chroniclers were often Lithuania's enemies, they distorted Lithuania's past, usually for religious reasons. In other cases the origin of the material remains unknown.⁴ Questions remain about the authenticity of sources such as letters of the Grand Duke Gediminas (1316-1341) to the pope and "Origo regis Jogaila et Wytholdi ducum Lithuaniae" [Jogaila's and Vytautas's ancestry] dealing with the death of Kęstutis and the power struggle between Jogaila and Vytautas.

Before the christening of Lithuania in 1387, Lithuania had no written language. The lack of a literary language meant Lithuanians would have to rely on histories written in foreign languages often by foreigners. This linguistic legacy may have delayed the creation of a Lithuanian national history. Nineteenth-century Lithuania activists would have to justify how Lithuania could have developed a great civilization without the widespread use of a native literature. The Lithuanian writer and ethnographer, Liudvikas Jucevičius (1813-1846) suggested that maybe the Lithuanians were not clever enough to invent their own writing.⁵

The Grand Duchy of Lithuania had no official language. The state used Latin in its correspondence with the Church and the West. Some letters and documents written before 1387 exist, but the Grand Dukes' scribes used Latin, German, or Church Slavonic depending on for whom they intended the document. By the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries Chancery Slavonic dominated the written state language in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. It was not a spoken idiom. Although Chancery Slavonic belonged to the east Slavic language group, it was a dialect unto itself that had thousands of non-Slavic words. Only in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries did Polish make substantial inroads into the legal and state documents of the Grand Duchy.

Medieval documents and narratives provide the most important written sources in reconstructing the origins of the Lithuanian state.

Among the narratives are the chronicles, annals, memoirs, and lives of the saints. Perhaps the most influential medieval chronicler for Lithuanian history was Jan Długosz (1415-1480). Długosz, who in many cases is the only source available, used earlier chronicles for his monumental *Historia Polonica*. A witness to many events about which he wrote, Długosz contributed to the creation of the stereotype of a barbaric and cruel Lithuania. Most nineteenth-century Polish writers used Długosz's chronicles as their primary source for information about Lithuania. For instance, the novelist Henryk Sienkiewicz (1846-1916) created one of the most entertaining and lasting images of the Battle of Grunwald (1410) where a motley group of Poles, Czechs, Lithuanians, Ruthenians, and Tatars defeated the Teutonic Knights. Basing his novel *The Teutonic Knights* on Długosz's chronicles, Sienkiewicz portrayed the Lithuanians as wild savages who fled from the Teutonic Knights during the battle.⁶ To counter this image Lithuanian historians, from Daukantas to the present, have argued that medieval Lithuania had a high level of civilization and that the Lithuanians did not flee at the Battle of Grunwald as Długosz and later Sienkiewicz claimed. Favorable or not, Sienkiewicz's heroes and villains often came from Lithuania, and they provided the reader with some of the most memorable characters in world literature.

Though there are many more chronicles, as for instance Michalo Lituanus' (ca. middle of the sixteenth century) *De moribus tartorum, litvanorum et moscorum*,⁷ the most important chronicle for the purposes of the Lithuanian national rebirth was the long version of the *Lithuanian Chronicle*.⁸ It went through various redactions some of whose authenticity are in question. Found in 1834 on the Bychovco estate, historians know it better as the "Bychovco Chronicle." In 1846 Teodor Narbutt published it in his *Pomniki do dziejów litewskich*.⁹ The original sixteenth century long version of the "Bychovco Chronicle" has not survive. Some unknown writer transcribed this Russian-Polish language document into the Latin alphabet. Dating from the sixteenth-century the original manuscript summarizes various legends, Russian chronicles, documents, and eyewitness accounts. Its importance lays in its uniquely Lithuanian viewpoint.¹⁰ Its collection of legends and prejudices dovetailed nicely with the views of nineteenth century Lithuanian activists. This chronicle reflected the power

struggle (1392-1430) between Jogaila and Vytautas. Written during the reign of the last two rulers of the Gediminas dynasty,¹¹ when the conflict between the Polish and Lithuanian magnates had intensified, this chronicle responded to Polish chroniclers like Długosz, who had portrayed Lithuania as a savage land. Although not the first to do so, the "Bychovco" version of the *Lithuanian Chronicle* put forward a fully developed theory that the Lithuanians were of Roman ancestry.¹² According to the *Lithuanian Chronicle* the Roman duke Palemon, fearing Attila the Hun, fled Rome with his retinue and sailed to the mouth of the Nieman river, where he settled and started a dynasty that eventually led to the founding of the historical Gediminas dynasty.

The assertion of Roman lineage made the Lithuanians superior to the Poles socially and politically. Besides serving their psychological needs, the Lithuanian szlachta used this theory for genealogical evidence in registering their claims of nobility with the tsarist government.¹³ The Polonized Lithuanian nobility also found this myth useful in refuting the Polish assertions that the Poles in 1413 ennobled the Lithuanians. The *Lithuanian Chronicle* set the Lithuanians apart from the Slavs and challenged the Sarmation theory¹⁴ that all the nobles of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth had a common ancestry. The *Lithuanian Chronicle's* biases made it into something of a Lithuanian national history for sixteenth-century chroniclers like Maciej Strykowski and for nineteenth-century historians like Daukantas. Although the *Lithuanian Chronicle* and the works of Daukantas were separated by four hundred years, their value lay not in their historical accuracy but in their uniquely Lithuanian viewpoint.¹⁵

Besides chronicles, nineteenth-century historians like Daukantas used newly discovered documents in their histories. Some sources like the "Lithuanian Metrics" [Acta Lithuanorum] were incomplete copies of archives of the chancellery of Lithuania from the fourteenth to the eighteenth centuries. It included the original treaties, acts of union, tax records, documents of privileges, and in general all important state documents. Wars, transfers, and restricted access to the "Lithuanian Metrics" have impeded scholars from publishing them fully. The historians of the nineteenth century knew about their existence but usually could not gain access to them.

Traditionally, Lithuania's historiography starts with Augustine Rotundus (Pol.: Mieleski, ca. 1520-1582). Unfortunately, his *Chronica sive historia Lithuaniae* did not survive a fire. Until recently historians believed that the oldest existing printed history of Lithuania was Maciej Strykowski's *Kronika polska, litewska, żmódzka i wszystkiej Rusi* [The Chronicle of Poland, Lithuania, Samogitia, and all of Russia] written in 1582.¹⁶ Writing his histories partially in verse, Strykowski (1547-1586) lived at a time when the distinction between a history and a chronicle was not very pronounced. Because not everything written was printed, chroniclers and even nineteenth-century historians would plagiarize long passages from previously written histories. Plagiarizing, borrowing, and copying were not great sins. Strykowski himself borrowed large sections for his histories from Marcin Krömer (1512-1589),¹⁷ Maciej Miechovius (1456-1523),¹⁸ and Jan Długosz. In turn Strykowski accused the Italian Alexander Guagnini (1538-1614) of plagiarizing his work. Guagnini in his *Sarmatia Europae* (1578)¹⁹ and Albert Wijuk-Kojałowicz in his *Historiae Lituanæ* (1650) edited and translated Strykowski's *The Chronicle of Poland, Lithuania, Samogitia, and all of Russia*. Kojałowicz justified plagiarism by claiming that a Latin translation would be more accessible to reading audiences. Following a long-held tradition of academic chicanery, nineteenth-century historians like Daukantas were not averse to borrowing their material, albeit more subtly. In Kojałowicz's case, by omitting the Polish and Russian parts of Strykowski's original, Kojałowicz made his work into a Lithuanian history.²⁰ Thus many modern historians start Lithuanian historiography with Kojałowicz. But as with Strykowski, Kojałowicz wrote about a medieval state rather than a nation, and he was not the first to do so.

Strykowski was somewhat of a Renaissance humanist. He wrote his histories in Polish rather than Latin. And, more so than his predecessors the medieval chroniclers who listed facts, Strykowski attempted to interpret his sources. Strykowski took what Hayden White calls the "unprocessed historical record,"²¹ and emplotted it. Furthermore Strykowski corrected what he believed were the mistakes of older chroniclers. Unfortunately Strykowski's "corrections" merely added more misinformation. For all of his errors, he proved

indispensable to nineteenth-century historians of Lithuania. Daukantas criticized Strykowski for including too much material on Poland and Russia. Nevertheless, Daukantas also relied on Strykowski. Because the *Lithuanian Chronicles*, the "Lithuanian Metrics," and archival material were usually inaccessible to many activists of the Lithuanistics movement, they knew about the theory of Lithuanian Roman ancestry only through Strykowski. Many of the products of the University of Vilnius like Daukantas's mentor, Ignacy Onacewicz, accepted Strykowski's theories concerning the Roman ancestry of the Lithuanians.

Although Strykowski could not have been a nationalist in the modern sense, he accentuated a Lithuanian state patriotism politically separate from Poland. Of course Strykowski's concept of patriotism excluded the Lithuanian-speaking masses, whereas any nobleman living in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania regardless of ancestry would be considered a Lithuanian. Essentially, patriotism in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania meant loyalty toward a cosmopolitan feudal state.²² Strykowski also believed that citizenship played a more important role in the state than religion or language. The nineteenth-century intelligentsia of the University of Vilnius could very easily use Strykowski's terminology and substitute the word citizenship for nationality and the word state for nation. Strykowski also had a certain Lithuanian sensibility. He included some Lithuanian passages in his *The Chronicle of Poland, Lithuania, Samogitia, and all of Russia*,²³ and despite Daukantas's protestations, Strykowski portrayed Lithuania favorably. By the eighteenth century the German historian August von Schlözer in his *Geschichte von Litauen, Kurland and Liefland* (1785) went beyond translating Strykowski. He interpreted and gave full credit to Strykowski. In addition, he used authentic chronicles, linguistics, and geography to put Lithuania's history into the context of world history. He was the harbinger of Lithuanian historicism.

Eighteenth-century Poland also produced advances in historiography. Under the leadership of Bishop Adam Naruszewicz (1733-1796) the collecting of documents and the writing of Polish history became more methodical and critical. He wrote a six-volume *Historja narodu polskiego*²⁴ and he started the collection of what would become *Teki Naruszewicza*, 230 volumes of historical sources.

Obviously this mammoth publication could not be the work of one person. The scribe of King Stanislaus Augustus Poniatowski did the collecting and copying of the documents. After Bishop Naruszewicz's death, Tadeusz Czacki (1765-1813) continued Naruszewicz's work, and in 1801 he completed his own two-volume work *O litewskich i polskich prawach*.²⁵ Based primarily on the *Lithuanian Statute*,²⁶ Czacki collected so much material about Lithuania that it was the most important source for studying Lithuanian history until the coming of Lelewel and the University of Vilnius historians.²⁷ Despite Daukantas's complaints that Naruszewicz distorted Lithuanian history, Lithuanian historiography could not have progressed without the pioneering work of Czacki and Naruszewicz.

The most important period for the formation of Lithuanian historiography came between 1803 and 1832, when the University of Vilnius had the status of an Imperial institution. It was the age of Lelewel, Narbutt, and Daukantas. Two trends, one critical-scientific, the other romantic-didactic emerged from the writings of these men. For Lithuanian historiography the romantic-didactic school of Narbutt and Daukantas overshadowed the critical school represented by Lelewel. An idealization of Lithuania's past for nationalist purposes was more important than a dispassionate analysis of documents. Nevertheless, no sharp line divided these two groups of historians, who knew each other's work. Narbutt remained throughout the nineteenth century the historian most often criticized for his exaggerations and credulity, yet historians cited his work more frequently than that of any other historian.

In contrast to Narbutt, two of the more careful and dispassionate historians of this time were Ignacy Daniłowicz (1787-1843) and Józef Jaroszewicz (1793-1860). Daniłowicz did not write a great deal. He collected and annotated two volumes of *Skarbiec dyplomatów* [A Treasury of Diplomas], which were published posthumously in 1862. He proved that some "facts" were in reality only legends, and he discovered that some medieval Lithuanian documents were forgeries. No one denied that Daniłowicz was a careful historian whose works Narbutt and Daukantas used. Because of the dry nature of his work, he had a limited impact on the Lithuanian national rebirth. Józef Jaroszewicz was similarly dry. Both Daniłowicz and Jaroszewicz wrote as insiders, which is to say as Lithuanians, but neither had the

grandiose vision of Daukantas. Romantics like Narbutt and Daukantas created a Lithuanian national history based on ideology. Being more scholarly, Daniłowicz and Jaroszewicz did not have the Lithuanian nationalist zeal that Narbutt had. Jaroszewicz and Daniłowicz did not fill in the gaps of Lithuanian history with their imaginations or anti-Polonisms. They were "merely" good scholars.

The Polish poets of Vilnius may have had a more lasting influence on the Lithuanian national rebirth than professional historians.²⁸ However, they did not create models for the writing of history. They popularized Lithuania's history. The Lithuanian intelligentsia of the late nineteenth century were all intimately acquainted with the works of Adam Mickiewicz (1789-1855), Juliusz Słowacki (1809-1849), Józef Kraszewski (1812-1887), and Ludwik Kondratowicz (1832-1862). While none of these writers had a Lithuanian national identity, many of their works had Lithuanian settings. Because the activists of the Lithuanian rebirth feared the extinction of Lithuanianism, the mere mention of Lithuania's name engendered enthusiasm among the late nineteenth-century Lithuanian intelligentsia. The Lithuanian activists would often read into the works of Polish writers their own concepts of nationality. In order to inflate their own culture and history, Lithuanians would often transform these Polish writers into Lithuanians, as they did when they turned Mickiewicz into Mickevičius or Mickus, a Lithuanian patriot.

The only one of these writers to contribute significantly to Lithuanian historiography was Józef Kraszewski. One of the most prolific writers in world history, he produced more than six hundred books—novels, plays, books of poetry, stories, newspaper essays, and historical works with an abundance of Lithuanian motifs. Kraszewski's three histories of Lithuania are the most pertinent to this study. In 1842 he completed the fourth volume of *Wilno od początków jego do roku 1750* [Vilnius from Its Beginnings to 1750]. Between 1847 and 1850 he published *Litwa*, which dealt with the Lithuanian language, mythology, customs, and history. In 1850 he published a separate work about Vytautas entitled *Litwa za Witolda* [Lithuania under Vytautas].²⁹ The three volumes of *Polska w czasie trzech rozbiorów* [Poland during the Three Partitions] (1873-1875) also contained a great deal of information about Lithuania. Because he

wrote so much, some have accused Kraszewski of being superficial and his histories of being merely historical novels.³⁰

Though Warsaw born, Kraszewski received his education in Vilnius, and there he flourished on Lithuanian soil, writing his histories as a Lithuanian insider who had digested the works of Długosz, Strykowski, Daniłowicz, and Narbutt. More importantly for the Lithuanian intelligentsia, Kraszewski sympathized with the emerging Lithuanian national rebirth, especially by supporting the efforts to publish the Lithuanian newspaper *Ausra*. Kraszewski did not know the Lithuanian language well, but he knew enough to quote folk songs, and he used Lithuanian words throughout his epic poems so that a purely Polish reading audience often could not understand all his references. Perhaps the best example of this is Kraszewski's most famous literary work, the poetic trilogy *Anafiel* (1840-1845), which the Lithuanian intelligentsia received with a great deal of enthusiasm.³¹

Kraszewski accepted uncritically some of the favorable misinformation and legends of the early chroniclers in his histories. For instance, he believed that the prehistoric Lithuanians had used a runic alphabet. He saw the christening of Lithuania as its denationalization and thus, with several exceptions like his portrayal of Algirdas, Kraszewski drew a sympathetic portrait of a civilized pre-Christian Lithuania.³² Consistent with Lithuanian prejudices, Kraszewski painted Jogaila unfavorably in his *Lithuania under Vytautas*. The Christianity and Polonization that Jogaila brought with him from Poland destroyed the Lithuanian nation.³³ Occasionally he depicted aspects of Lithuanian history as wild and savage. The medieval Grand Duke Algirdas (Pol.: Olgierd), whom the Lithuanians perceived as a hero, Kraszewski portrayed as cruel.

When writing about Lithuania, the historians at the University of Vilnius used sources from Medieval, Renaissance, and Baroque historian/chroniclers and ethnography. The so-called Romantics received their university training after Napoleon's defeat, while their early education had been shaped by the Age of the Enlightenment. Enlightenment rationalism mixed freely with romantic imagination as German Romantics like Herder, Lessing and Goethe had as much influence on nineteenth century Lithuanian activists as Voltaire. In the field of history, Daukantas used the German arch-conservative August

von Kotzebue's³⁴ (1761-1819) *Preussens aeltere Geschichte* (1808) more than Lelewel's³⁵ works. Because of its anti-Polish tendencies, the twelve-volume *Istoriia Gosudarstva Rossiiskogo* [History of the Russian State] of the Russian historian Nikolai Karamzin (1766-1826) also provided inspiration for Daukantas.

In the early nineteenth century Vilnius was a Polish intellectual center whose influences flowed east and west. Essentially contemporaries, Daukantas, Narbutt, Mickiewicz, and even Kraszewski were influenced by the same intellectual forces, and because they came from the same place, Vilnius, they influenced each other. After the closing of the University of Vilnius in 1832, Vilnius became a provincial backwater. The universities of Moscow, St. Petersburg, and Königsberg became poor substitutes for the closed university.

Because of their distortions and mistakes, many works of the Lithuanian intelligentsia seem naive by today's standards. They had vivid imaginations. For example, Liudvikas Jucevičius even believed that giants literally existed in prehistoric Lithuania. By the standards of their own age, however the nineteenth century writers were doing the best they could with what they knew. Often today's historian must rely on an apparently inaccurate nineteenth-century histories or medieval chronicles simply because they are the only sources available on the subject. For all of the distortions and imaginative scholarship, scholars like Daukantas could cite more than a hundred sources in their books. In the number of sources used and in the selective way in which they used those sources, nineteenth century Lithuanians went beyond the chroniclers or historians of previous centuries.

INSTITUTIONS, FOREIGNERS AND NATIVES

Besides historians and their sources, institutions also acted as a wellspring for the activists of the Lithuanian national rebirth. A pioneer of Lithuanian archeology, Graf Eustach Tyszkiewicz (1814-1873), established the Vilnius Archeological Commission in 1842, and the Museum of Antiquity in Vilnius in 1855. After the University of Vilnius closed in 1832, the Archeological Commission and the museum became the only scholarly institutions left in Vilnius. Tyszkiewicz understood archeology in the broadest sense. He often

added exhibits to the museum without regard to their scholarly value. The Russian authorities sanctioned these projects and allowed Tyszkiewicz to keep some of the antiques and old books that had once belonged to the University of Vilnius. Because it functioned under Russian auspices, the Archeological Commission had to be careful that its research and exhibits would not hint at Polish irredentism.³⁶ Although the Commission did research in Lithuanian studies and ethnology, the Commission focused on the political history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Because the members of the Commission believed that the union between Poland and Lithuania was the most important event in the political and cultural history of Lithuania,³⁷ they understood Lithuania's history in the context of Polish history. In spite of the aristocratic Polish composition of the committee, the members elected several Lithuanians to full membership in the Archeological Commission including Bishop Motiejus Valančius, Mikołaj Akielewicz, Ławryn Iwiński, and Ambraziej Kossarzewski. Possibly because Simonas Daukantas wrote his works in the Lithuanian language, the Archeological Commission did not elect him as a member. The foremost Lithuanian historian of his time, Daukantas transcribed documents and gave them to the museum, but socially he must have been unacceptable to the commission. Valančius also wrote in Lithuanian, but as a bishop he was acceptable to the aristocratic commission members.

Adam Honory Kirkor (1818-1886), the curator of the Antiquity Museum of Vilnius, illustrates the difficulty of labeling someone with a modern national identity. He was a riddle wrapped in an enigma. Linguistically a Pole, he was born in a predominantly Belarusin region. Kirkor proclaimed, "I am a Lithuanian,"³⁸ and yet he published primarily in Polish and Russian. As a civil servant he was loyal to the Russian government, but he denounced the Tsarist government in his memoirs.³⁹ He often wrote in Russian but he was Polish in his biases. Among his Polish works were *Przechadzki po Wilnie i jeg okolicach* [Walks through Vilnius and Its Environs], *Litwa i Ruś* [Lithuania and Rus], *Skarbiec katedry Wileńskiej* [Treasures of Vilnius Cathedral], and *Groby wielkoksiażęce i królewskie w Wilnie* [Grand Ducal and Royal tombs in Vilnius]. Sometimes Kirkor wrote about ethnolinguistic Lithuania, at other

times he wrote about the Grand Duchy of Lithuania or about the Northwestern region of the Russian empire: the Vilnius, Kaunas, and Grodno gubernii. Besides being an amateur historian and archeologist, Kirkor edited books and periodicals. In 1859 he started his own publishing house in which he printed books in Polish, Russian, and Lithuanian, and he even planned to publish books in the Belarusian language. In a period when ethnic groups began to differentiate among themselves linguistically, Kirkor promoted ethnolinguistic pluralism.⁴⁰

In Russian, Kirkor wrote the third volume of *Живописная Россия* [Picturesque Russia], under the general editorship of Piotr Semionov (1827-1914). The Russian authorities wanted to eliminate the idea that Lithuania had ever constituted a state. They combined Lithuania and Belarus into their concept of the Northwest region. Conforming to Russian guidelines, Kirkor wrote about what he was supposed to, but in the process and with considerable subtlety he managed also to write about Lithuania and its medieval greatness.⁴¹ Kirkor did not eliminate Lithuania's name from the history of the Northwest region, he accentuated it. The third volume of *Picturesque Russia* pleased no one other than the activists of the Lithuanian rebirth.⁴² The Poles did not like the use of the Russian language and the Russians did not like the content.

Foreigners who were not part of the Polish-Lithuanian culture of the nineteenth century do not belong in this study. Some non-Lithuanian societies, however, had an impact on the Lithuanian national rebirth and the eventual professionalization of the historical profession. The activity of the Russian Imperial Geographic Society founded in 1845 contrasted with the chaos of Lithuanian historiography found among the amateur historians of the Lithuanian national rebirth. The Society, with its department of Northwestern studies, was the first scholarly institution that systematically began the collection of Lithuanian folk culture. By studying Lithuania as a part of their Northwest region, the Russians intended to eliminate Lithuania as an independent subject of study. Yet, the efforts of Russian scholars to preserve and collect Lithuanian ethnography fostered an interest in Lithuanian studies. They even maintained contacts with many of the activists of the Lithuanian rebirth.

Other societies like the German *Litauische Literarische Gesellschaft*, based in Tilsit, and the Polish *Towarzystwo Ludoznawcze* [Ethnographers Society] based in Lwów contributed to researching Lithuania's past. Freed from a nationalist agenda, non-Lithuanians were often in a position to be more objective. Individual scholars like the linguist and archeologist Adalbert Bezzenberger, the Polish linguist Baudouin de Courtenay, the Russian linguist Filip Fortunatov, and many others added to the decipherment of Lithuanian history. But these societies and scholars did not have an interest in reviving the Lithuanian language or its culture. They had no nationalist agendas in their attempts at preserving Lithuanian culture. Some had more sympathy, others less, for the Lithuanian national rebirth. Yet the activists of the Lithuanian rebirth used their works. In rare cases a scholar like Eduard Wolter (1856-1941) could reinvent himself as a Lithuanian—Volteris. Of German descent but raised in Latvia under Russian cultural influences, Wolter taught a variety of subjects at Kaunas University in the inter-war period. As a member of the Russian Imperial Geographic society he investigated Lithuanian fortress hills, graves, songs, and ethnographic material of various sorts. Overall, German, Russian, and even Polish scholars from the Congress Kingdom did not have the nationalist zeal that Lithuanians or Poles of eastern Lithuania had about Lithuania. They were often good scholars, but they did not belong to the ethnos of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

Poles who lived in the Congress Kingdom but who had not embroiled themselves in Polish-Lithuanian hostilities could look at Lithuanian affairs sympathetically. Yet, even in their sympathies, Poles had a basic misunderstanding as to what the Lithuanians wanted. The Polish historian, sociologist and socialist, Bolesław Limanowski (1835-1935) wrote about Lithuania and his vision of the relationship between Poland and Lithuania:

Our efforts to unite Lithuania to Congress Poland were interpreted incorrectly, as centralization, as a state which would only benefit the Polish nation. Certainly we wanted to reestablish the old Republic's boundaries, but we believed in republican federalism, and we wanted to guarantee rights for all national groups constituting it; also as populists we backed the awakening of national feelings in the Lithuanian and Rusin people.⁴³

The Lithuanian intelligentsia wanted no part of "republican federalism." While in exile in Paris, Limanowski became active in the Lithuanian society *Želmuo* [fresh grass]. Although originally a part of the larger Polish organization *Związek Narodowy Polski* [Polish National Union], *Želmuo* split from the Polish mother organization in 1896. *Želmuo*'s aim was to unite the Lithuanians living in Paris and to save the Lithuanian language. Limanowski was not a Lithuanian, and yet his regard for freedom and justice made him sensitive to the Lithuanian movement. In 1895 Limanowski wrote a short history of Lithuania, *Historja Litwy*, in which he portrayed Lithuania's past in a manner compatible with the Lithuanian national rebirth. As previously stated Lithuanian activists could and did use sources like Limanowski's *History of Lithuania*.

THE *KRAJOWSCY*

By the late nineteenth century when the dividing line between Poles and Lithuanian was becoming increasingly clear, there remained a group of Lithuanians who still had peculiar loyalty to the old Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The *krajowscy* (Border-landers) were mainly Polish-speaking intellectuals from the region around Vilnius who sought to prevent the division of Lithuania along ethnic lines.⁴⁴ Unlike Piłsudski and the federalists who wanted to resurrect the old Commonwealth the *krajowscy* were utopians who tried to avoid the reality of rabid nationalism.⁴⁵ Scattered and few in number, at times the *krajowscy*'s interpretation of Lithuanian history could be compatible with the Lithuanian national rebirth's version of Lithuanian history. The most noteworthy of the *krajowscy* historians were Konstancya Skirmuntt (1865-1934), Józef Albin Herbaczewski (1876-1944), and Michał Römer (1880-1946). Most of them belong to the period after 1904.

The patriarch of the Lithuanian national rebirth, Jonas Basanavičius, (1851-1927) who would not tolerate hybrid Lithuanians like Kraszewski, viewed Konstancya Skirmuntt as a Lithuanian, "though she writes in Polish, it is noteworthy that as a Lithuanian girl she knows how to look at the world through Lithuanian eyes."⁴⁶ Whether one uses terminology like "Lithuanian eyes" or "insider," the activists of the Lithuanian rebirth felt that Lithuanians had an innate,

almost mystical, knowledge of their country. But nothing is ever that simple when dealing with the ethnos of Lithuania. Judging Skirmuntt's national tendencies is difficult, she wrote in Polish, but she clearly presented a traditional romanticized version of Lithuania's history. In spite of her romanticism she attempted a balanced account without the anti-Polish militancy found among the Lithuanian rebirth nationalists. In several places she writes that the Lithuanians needed the Poles as much as the Poles need the Lithuanians in defeating common enemies. Unlike the nationalists she considered "our" nation the Commonwealth, but later she would contradict herself and consider "our" nation Lithuania. She rejoiced over the lifting of the press ban in 1904, and she finished her book with the words of Vincas Kudirka which would become the Lithuanian national anthem.⁴⁷ All of her works are short, the longest being one 166 pages in length. Who made up the audience for these little books is unclear. Evidently she wrote Polish better than Lithuanian and she may have tried to reach out to the Polish-reading audience. Although Skirmuntt was not among the Lithuanian activist, they found her works a useful pedagogic tool.

In the litmus test of Lithuanian history, she considered Jogaila a weak, irresolute ruler. She exalted Vytautas over Jogaila but admitted that Jogaila was Vytautas's overlord.⁴⁸ Skirmuntt believed that no one deserved a king's crown more than Vytautas because he had saved Europe from the Mongol hordes. She also believed that Vytautas spoke his "beloved Lithuanian" language.⁴⁹ Certainly she had the "correct" interpretation of Vytautas.

In 1914, Skirmuntt wrote a cryptic ten page pamphlet entitled *Nosce Te Ipsum*. Written in Lithuanian, Skirmuntt, wrote that "our" nation has risen from the people. She asserted that for 500 years we have suffered from the Poles and now especially from the Polish Endeks.⁵⁰ Changed political circumstances made it appear as if her opinions had changed, but in reality her vision of Lithuania remained consistent, a szlachta political nation that did not stress language as a source of division between Lithuanian and Pole. She emphasized that the Lithuanian boyars freely accepted Polonization and that we (meaning the Lithuanians) should not blame the Poles.⁵¹ Skirmuntt blamed most of Lithuania's shortcomings on "ourselves." She tried to

reclaim for Lithuania many of those of Polish culture whom the Lithuanians had written off as Polish. She wrote "we have rejected Mickiewicz, Kondratowicz, Moniuszka, Narbutt, and many others simply because they wrote in Polish. What a grave mistake! Their descent, manner, nature and country were ours, and that has more worth than the language they used."⁵² In many ways this pamphlet says very little about Lithuanian historiography, but it says volumes about Skirmuntt's vision of Lithuania. It proved to be an unrealistic and outdated vision.

Nevertheless, the activists of the Lithuanian national rebirth used anything they perceived as valuable for their cause. Because these activists were not professional historians, they did not study Lithuania's past systematically. They grabbed whatever was at hand and either translated or wrote compilations of foreign works. Few attempted original research, and when they did, they often made mistakes. Some insignificant archeological find or myth might capture someone's imagination and become the basis for an elaborate work of history. In nationalist histories, the inspiration might precede the source and romanticization might obscure historical realities.

NOTES

1. The *Quedlinburg Chronicle* first recorded the name of Lithuania [Lituae] in 1009. Juozas Žiugžda et al., eds., *Lietuvos TSR Istorijos Šaltiniai* [Lithuanian SSR History Sources], vol. 1. (Vilnius: Valstybinė Politinės ir Mokslinės Literatūros Leidykla, 1955), 25.

2. Petras Dusburgietis, *Prūsijos Žemės Kronika*, trans. and eds. K. Korsakas et al. from Petri von Dusburg *Chronica Terrae Prussiae*, XIII century (Vilnius: Vaga, 1985).

3. Henrikas Latvis and Hermanas Vartbergė, *Livonijos Kronikos*, trans. by Juozas Jurginis from *Heinrici Chronicon Lyvoniae*, XIII century (Vilnius: Mokslo, 1991).

4. The story of a Lithuanian pagan high priest, the *Krivė*, originated with Peter Dusburg's *Chronica Terrae Prussiae*. Most likely Dusburg believed that the pagan Balts had something like a pope. The *Krivė* was a mythical high priest of the ancient Lithuanian pagans. Nineteenth century Lithuanians reasoned that if Lithuania had something like a pope, then pagan Lithuania must have been literate and highly organized—a sign of a high level of civilization. Some have even speculated that without a priestly class, pre-historic Lithuania could not develop literacy.

5. Liudvikas Jucevičius, *Litwa pod względem starożytnych zabytków, obczajów i zwyczajów, skreslona przez Ludwika z Pokiewia* [Lithuania in Regards to Its Ancient

Ruins, Traditions and Customs by Ludwik from Pokiew] in *Raštai*, [Writings] trans. and ed., D. Urbas, (Vilnius: Valstybinė Grožinės Literatūros Leidykla, 1959), 57.

6. Henryk Sienkiewicz, *The Teutonic Knights*, trans. Alicia Tyszkiewicz, (New York: Hippocrene Books, 1993), 15.

7. Michael the Lithuanian, *About the Tatar, Lithuanian and Muscovite traditions*. Scholars disagree about who used this pseudonym.

8. *Lietuvos Metraštis* [The Lithuanian Chronicle], trans. by Rimantas Jasas and edited by K. Korsakas et al. (Vilnius: Vaga, 1971). This so called Bychovco Chronicle has a history onto itself. At one time scholars even thought it was Narbut's forgery. There were as many as five sixteenth-century redactions of the short version of this chronicle. Only one transcribed copy by Teodor Narbut remains.

9. Teodor Narbut, *Pomniki do dziejów litewskich* [Monuments of Lithuanian History] (Vilnius: Rafałowicz, 1846).

10. Ignas Jonynas, "Lietuvos Istoriografija" *Istorijos Baruose*, 124.

11. Sigismund I (1506-48); Sigismund August (1548-1572).

12. Modern historians do not know how the theory of Roman ancestry began, but even before Długosz, medieval chroniclers such as Wigand von Marburg and Peter Dusburg had elaborated on this theory.

13. Egidijus Aleksandravičius, "Socialinės ir Psichologinės Romantinės Istoriografijos Prielaidos" [Social and Psychological Assumptions in Lithuania's Romantic Historiography], *Sietynas*, 9 (Vilnius: 1990): 140-154.

14. Among its many meanings, the Sarmation theory claimed that the Polish, Lithuanian, and Rus' aristocracy had a common ancestry in the Sarmatians. It was an attempt to unite people who were linguistically and historically different. See Stanisław Cynarski's, "The Shape of Sarmatian Ideology in Poland," *Acta Poloniae Historica*, 12 (1968): 10.

15. Ignas Jonynas, "Lithuania's historiography," *Istorijos Baruose*, 159.

16. Julia Radziszewska in 1978 published a recently discovered earlier history by Strykowski in which he largely ignored Poland's history. Maciej Strykowski, *O początkach, wywodach, dzielnościach, sprawach rycerskich i domowych sławnego narodu litewskiego, żemodzkiego i ruskiego* (Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1978).

17. Marcin Krömer, *Kronika Polska*, 30 vols. (Cracow: Loba, 1611. Obecne 2-e wyd. jez. pol. Sanok: Pollak, 1857).

18. Maciej Miechovius, *Chronica Polonorum* (Cracow: 1519).

19. Alexandri Guagnini, *Sarmatia Europae discriptio quae Regnum Poloniae, Lithuaniam, Samogitiam, Russiam, Masoviam, Prusiam, Pomeraniam, Livoniam et Moschoviae, Tartarineque partem complectitur* (Cracow: M. Wierzbęta, 1578).

20. Albertas Vijūkas-Kojelavičius, *Lietuvos Istorija*, trans. and eds. J. Lankutis et al. from *Historiae Lituanae* Danzig: 1650 (Vilnius: Vaga, 1988), 42.

21. Hayden White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1973), 5.

22. Alfredas Bumblauskas, "Renesanso Lietuvoje ir Nacionalinės Lietuvių Kultūros Formavimosi Pradžios Klausimu" [The Renaissance in Lithuania and the Question of the Beginning of a Lithuanian National Culture], *Istorija*, 22 (Vilnius: Moksas, 1982): 52.

23. Maciej Strykowski, *Kronika polska, litewska, żmódzka i wszystkiej Rusi 1582* (Warsaw: Glucksberg, 1846), 150.

24. Adam Naruszewicz, *Historya narodu polskiego* [History of the Polish Nation], 1780-1786. 6 vols. (Cracow: Nakł. Wydawn. Biblioteki Polskiej, 1859-1860). Although he ended his history with 1386, he included a great deal of information about Lithuania.

25. Tadeusz Czacki, *O litewskich i polskich prawach* [About Lithuanian and Polish laws], 2 vols. (Warsaw: Rogacz, 1800-1801).

26. A sixteenth century Lithuanian legal code. Aside from the Justinian Code, the *Lithuanian Statute* was the only law code of its kind in Europe. Although written in Chancery Slavonic, the historian Konstantinas Jablonskis collected over a hundred Lithuanian language terms in the document, indicating the Lithuanian origins of this document. See Konstantinas Jablonskis, *Lietuviški žodžiai Lietuvos raštinių kalboje* [Lithuanian words in Lithuania's written language] (Kaunas: Lietuvos Istorijos Draugija, 1941).

27. Mykolas Biržiška, *Iš mūsų Kultūros ir Literatūros Istorijos* [From our Cultural and Literary History] (Kaunas: Spindulio, 1931), 163.

28. The literary historian Mykolas Biržiška (1882-1962) rejected the idea of Polish literary influences on Lithuanian literature. He wrote, "Not having found enough romantic material the Polish literati decided to use Lithuania because 'Litwa dawna i Litwa ludowa stanowiła jakby wymarzoną krainę'." [Old Lithuania and folk Lithuania made Lithuania into something like a land of dreams]. He further wrote, "let us drop this reliance on foreign literary influences." Mykolas Biržiška, *Iš mūsų Kultūros ir Literatūros Istorijos*, 2.

29. Kraszewski had previously serialized *Litwa za Witolda* in his scholarly journal *Athenaeum*.

30. Manfred Kridl, *A Survey of Polish Literature and Culture*, trans. Olga Scherer-Vorski (Hague: Mouton, 1967), 334.

31. *Anafiel* consists of *Witolorauda*, a series of Lithuanian legends; *Mindowe*, about king Mindaugas; and *Witoldowe boje*, about the battles of Vytautas. In the first Lithuanian national newspaper *Ausra*, one of the authors, Mikšas compared *Witolorauda* to the *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, *Aeneid*, and the *Old and New Testaments*, *Ausra* 1, 1883. Although written in Polish, some Lithuanians consider *Anafiel* to be Lithuania's national epic.

32. Kraszewski, in his history *Wilno od początków jego do roku 1750*, wrote "Poland has digested Lithuania."

33. Józef Kraszewski, *Litwa: Starożytne dzieje, ustawy, język, wiara, obyczaje, pieśni, przysłowia, podania* [Lithuania: Ancient History, Laws, Language, Religion, Customs, Songs, Proverbs, and Stories], vol. 1 *Historia do XIII wieku* (Warsaw: Strabski, 1847-1850), 516.

34. In 1819, a German nationalist student, Karl Sand, assassinated him, provoking a period of reaction. Kotzebue was also famous as a playwright who satirized Schlegel.

35. Polish historian and political activist (1786-1861). During his tenure at the University of Vilnius he formulated a theory of history that stressed the critical use of documents and the idealization of the past.

36. Aleksandravičius and Kulakauskas, *Carų valdžioje*, 249.

37. *Ibid.*, 253.

38. "Letter to his wife," quoted in Juozas Maceika, "Adomas Honoris Kirkoras. Jo Gyvenimas ir Darbai" [Adam Honory Kirkor. His Life and Works], in *Pasivaikščiujimai po Vilnių ir jo apylinkes* by Adomas Honoris Kirkoras (Vilnius: Mintis, 1991), 10. Translated from *Przechadzki po Wilnie i jej okolicach* (Vilnius: Maurycy Orgelbrand, 1859).

39. Maceika, "Adomas Honoris Kirkoras. Jo Gyvenimas ir Darbai," 10.

40. Aleksandravičius and Kulakauskas, *Carų valdžioje*, 284.

41. *Ibid.*, 15.

42. Antanas Kulakauskas, "Lietuva "Vaizdingosios Rusijos" Leidinyje" [Lithuania in *Picturesque Russia*, introduction to Adomas Honoris Kirkoras, *Lietuva nuo seniausių laikų iki 1882 metų* [Lithuania from the Oldest Time to 1882] Живописная Россия, trans. from Russian by Vytautas Visockas (Vilnius: Mintis, 1995), 10.

43. Boleśław Limanowski, *Pamiętniki, 1835-1870* [Memoirs, 1835-1870] (Warsaw: Rój, 1937), 170.

44. Lieven, *The Baltic Revolution*, 163. Originally the word meant a supporter of the St. Peterburg newspaper *Kraj*.

45. Many of the *krajowscy* were noted for their tolerance and sympathies for the inter-war Lithuanian nation. The publisher Ludwik Abramowicz and the lawyer and book collector Tadeusz Wróblewski, defended Lithuanian rights in the inter-war Vilnius region. Because Piłsudski and Lucjan Żeligowski, who led the armed take-over of Vilnius in 1920, belonged to the same cultural milieu as the *krajowscy*, the term took on a pejorative meaning among the Lithuanians. The antagonism between Poles and Lithuanians over the Vilnius question made the *krajowscy* and their notion of citizenship in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania anachronistic.

46. Jonas Basanavičius [pseud. J.B - s.], review of *Z najstarszych czasów plemienia litewskiego* by Konstancja Skirmuntt, in *Varpas*, 1 January 1893, 10.

47. Konstancja Skirmuntt, *Istoriija Lietuwos: Trumpa Apysaka* [A short Tale of Lithuania's History], trans. Petras Vileišis (New York: Lietuwiszkojo Bałso, 1887.), 145.

48. *Ibid.*

49. *Ibid.*, 103.

50. The popular name of the National Democratic Party, which was associated with the nationalism of Roman Dmowski.

51. Konstancja Skirmuntt [pseud. Futurus], *Nosce te Ipsum* (Vilnius: Znico, 1914), 7.

52. *Ibid.*, 9.

IV

THE LITHUANISTICS MOVEMENT: APPROACHING A MODERN CONCEPT OF LITHUANIA

When the peoples, inspired by the national idea, were stirred to mould their destinies anew, and, looking back with longing to the more distant past, based upon it their claims for independence or for unity, history was one of the most effective weapons in their armouries; and consequently a powerful motive was supplied for historical investigation. The inevitable result was the production of some crude uncritical histories, written with national prejudice and political purpose, redeemed by the genuine pulse of national aspiration.

JOHN BAGNELL BURY

THE SAMOGITIAN 'NATIONAL MOVEMENT'

In addition to the activities at the University of Vilnius which fostered the beginnings of the Lithuanian national rebirth, today's Lithuanians write about the Samogitian national movement. In reality the Samogitian national movement was a nebulous Lithuanian cultural phenomena. Samogitia differed from other regions in Lithuania. Unlike eastern Lithuania, where there were pronounced differences between lord and peasant, in Samogitia the numerous petty szlachta did not substantially differ from the peasants. Often the only difference between the peasantry and the Samogitian szlachta was that the petty boyars had political privileges and could assume government offices. Because the use of the Polish language signified education and status, the petty szlachta often spoke Polish.¹ But they also spoke Lithuanian, which enabled them to maintain better contacts with the peasantry. The peasants in Samogitia were more prosperous than in eastern Lithuania because they were not serfs. They had to pay a land rent to the lord, but the rent did not burden them as much as the

corvée. Frequently the lord and the peasant were financial equals in Samogitia.

Essentially the Samogitian national rebirth centered around individuals who encouraged an interest in Lithuanistics. Daukantas and Valančius were the most influential individuals of the Samogitian national rebirth, but an analysis of their activity will come later. The first center or rather leader of the Samogitian national rebirth movement was the bishop of Samogitia, Józef Giedroyć (1754-1838). He translated the *New Testament* into the Lithuanian language, and while in Rome, he translated Italian poetry into Lithuanian. Despite bishop Giedroyć's importance as a patron, his interest in Lithuanistics waned. Eventually individuals like Dionizas Poška took over the leadership of the Samogitian movement. Leadership here means nothing more than maintaining ties with many of the Lithuanian elite, an easy endeavor because the Lithuanian linguistic elites numbered only in the hundreds.

In 1841 Liudvikas Jucevičius compiled and wrote a compendium of 190 biographies of *Learned Samogitians*.² In this work Jucevičius reflects some typical attitudes of the Samogitian petty szlachta. For instance, Jucevičius considered all people who spoke Lithuanian to be Samogitians and that Samogitian was the Lithuanian national language. Many of those whom Jucevičius included in his *Learned Samogitians* were not Samogitian at all but merely people who spoke Lithuanian. Nor did Jucevičius have Daukantas's hatred of Poles.³ He praises "the good hearted" teacher Józef Narkiewicz for teaching the Polish language and raising the educational level of Samogitian youth.⁴ The question then arises, why include in an analysis of Lithuanian identity someone like Jucevičius, who wrote in Polish and who did not see a clear distinction between Poles and Lithuanians? Jucevičius fostered the use of the Lithuanian language, but he saw no contradiction in prohibiting its use in the middle schools. Yet everything that Jucevičius wrote about was Lithuanian, and maybe most important of all, Jucevičius's writings have a Lithuanian feel about them that transcends the use of the Polish language. He regarded Lithuania as a living nation with a vibrant people. In contrast to luminaries like Mickiewicz, Kraszewski, or Narbutt, the writers of the Samogitian national movement did not write about a lost and dead szlachta nation. Both Daukantas and Jucevičius believed that the

peasants who spoke Lithuanian were the inheritors of the legacy of the medieval Grand Dukes.

Some of the writers of the Samogitian national rebirth wrote historical poems. For instance, Silvestras Valiūnas (Pol.: Sylwester Walenowicz, 1789-1831) wrote one poem *Birutės Daina* (Birutės Song) about Kęstutis's wife and Vytautas's mother. Others like Antanas Strazdas (Pol.: Antoni Drozdowski, 1762-1833) wrote peasant-oriented anti-szlachta poetry. Jucevičius included in his *Learned Samogitians* many writers who have no significance other than as early practitioners of the Lithuanian language. The works of some Lithuanian writers have not survived and are known thanks only to their successors or Jucevičius.⁵

Typical of the Samogitian national movement was the Jesuit Ksawier Bohusz (1746-1820). As a linguist and a historian he was an amateur. He barely knew the Lithuanian language, and he lived most of his life in Warsaw. In 1808, Bohusz published a study of the origins of the Lithuanian nation and language in Warsaw.⁶ Inevitably those who studied one had to study the other. Bohusz mistakenly believed that some of the classical Latin authors such as Virgil and Ovid had been translated before the invention of the printing press and that the Lithuanians had a written language in the Middle Ages. A historian like Joachim Lelewel scorned such a naive and inaccurate view of Lithuanian origins. Lelewel countered Bohusz's arguments by asserting that historical conclusions cannot be based on feeble circumstantial linguistic guesswork.⁷ Bohusz also maintained that Lithuanian was a pure language and not a mixture of other languages.⁸ Bohusz cited sources such as catechisms, dictionaries, and chronicles as evidence for his theories. According to Bohusz, the edicts of the Teutonic Knights prohibiting the use of the Lithuanian written language brought about the extinction of the Lithuanian written word. The introduction of Russian (Chancery Slavonic) as the governmental language and the Polonization of the Lithuanian upper classes after the Union of Lublin also contributed to the demise of the Lithuanian language.⁹ Because Bohusz blamed all the right villains, his ideas fit nicely into some of the works of the Samogitian national rebirth.

For the purposes of this study Dionizas Poška and Liudvikas Jucevičius stand out as leaders in the Samogitian national rebirth.

Daukantas and the appearance of *Auszra* are turning points in the development of the Lithuanian national consciousness as well as in the development of Lithuanian historicism. Daukantas had predecessors and successors, but none as significant as Daukantas himself or the newspaper *Auszra*. At best Poška and Jucevičius fill in the historical gap between the early nineteenth century when the University of Vilnius was the intellectual center for a hybrid Lithuanian culture, influenced and dominated by a form of nascent Polish nationalism, and the late nineteenth-century Lithuanian national rebirth, which clearly distinguished the difference between a Pole and a Lithuanian.

POŠKA

Dionizas Poška (Pol.: Dyonizy Paszkiewicz, 1765-1830), a petty nobleman who studied at but never graduated from the College at Kražiai, was essentially self-taught. He furthered his education by corresponding with the students and professors of the University of Vilnius, such as the historians Joachim Lelewel and Ignacy Onacewicz and the Russian literary historian Ivan Loboiko. A dilettante, Poška dabbled in virtually all things Lithuanian and Samogitian. He wrote Lithuanian poems, Lithuanian translations of Virgil, Ovid, Krasicki, Lithuanian aphorisms, and epigrams and his most ambitious undertaking, a Polish-Latin-Lithuanian dictionary which he completed only to the letter "s." Between 1821 and 1824 he wrote his most famous poem, a 164-line work about a Lithuanian and Samogitian peasant. Although Poška condemned serfdom, he was not a social reformer. In this poem a dialogue takes place between a landlord and a serf in which the landlord refuses to intercede on behalf of the serf with the tsar of Russia or the viceroy of Poland because the landlord "sings his song according to them" and "it is dishonorable for a boyar to snitch on another lord."¹⁰

He also built the first Lithuanian ethnographic museum, which he hollowed out of an old oak tree trunk called a *Baublys*. Although an amateurish oddity, the *Baublys* attracted scholars from Vilnius, as well as Adam Mickiewicz who mentions the *Baublys* in his epic poem *Pan Tadeusz*.¹¹ The *Baublys*' collection of antiques was quite impressive for its time. Poška wrote either in Polish or in Lithuanian depending on his audience. In spite of the status of the Polish

language, Poška wrote letters to some of his fellow Samogitians in the vernacular.¹²

Because he was an amateur, a survey of Lithuanian historiography does not usually include Poška. Nevertheless, he wrote three significant articles concerning Lithuanian history. In 1823 he wrote *O Starożytnych Obrządkach Religijnych Pogańskich W Xięstwach Litewskim i Żmuydskim* [About Ancient Pagan Religious Rites in the Lithuanian and Samogitian Duchies], though it remained unpublished until 1959, when it appeared in a Lithuanian edition of Poška's *Writings*. His most important work dealing with Lithuania's history appeared in three installments in *Dziennik Warszawski* [Warsaw Daily] in 1829 entitled *Rosmyślanie Wieśniaka Rolnika. - O Historii Narodu Litewskiego i Żmudzkiego, oraz o jego języku* [Thoughts of a village farmer: About the Lithuanian and Samogitian Nation's History and its Language]. He wrote an open letter addressed to Joachim Lelewel that he used as an introduction to *Thoughts of a village farmer* called *Kilka Słów Przedwstępnych do Kogobadź Mającego zamiar Pisać Dzieje Litwy i Żmudzi* [Several introductory words to anyone intending to write the history of Lithuania and Samogitia]. Beyond these three works Poška attempted to write parts of Lithuania's history in verse; nothing, however, has survived of these works.

Even though Poška was a little older and less educated than Daukantas, the two knew of each other, and Daukantas mentions in his *Deeds of the Old Lithuanians and Samogitians* the person who lives in the *Baublys*. Poška even made editorial comments on Daukantas's *Deeds*.¹³ They were both Samogitians interested in Lithuania's past but the clearly defined militancy and anti-Polonism found in Daukantas is absent from Poška's writings. Whereas Daukantas is an isolated but conscious nationalist, Poška represents the more typical mentality of a resident of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of his time. He wrote primarily in Polish, and he voiced no separatist or national sentiments, nor did he have any notions of Lithuania nationalism. Nevertheless, Poška wanted fairness for Lithuania's history. Evidently the publication of Teodor Waga's *Historja książąt i królów polskich* [The History of Polish Kings and Dukes] originally printed in 1767 and then reprinted in 1818 and 1824 angered Poška because "in an accurate book like this with more than four hundred pages, there are only three pages dealing with all of our

Lithuanian history.... It seems to me that we Lithuanians and Samogitians are worth a better history.”¹⁴ Evidently Poška believed that the only way to receive fair treatment was to write a new separate history of Lithuania. Poška also felt that either a Lithuanian or Polish scholar could write a new history based on current research. But he complained that the religious biases of Długosz, Krömer, Strykowski, and Kojalowicz disposed them adversely toward Lithuania:

One after another copied from each other that the Lithuanians being pagans were scarcely worth the name of human beings... and when the Lithuanians defended themselves they were called drunks, barbarians, etc.... Later historians using those same ideas unwittingly wrote that Sarmatian refugees inhabited Lithuania; of course these Polish historians wanted to prove that Lithuania rightfully belonged to Poland.... What else can we expect from the Germans, the Russians, and other nations who suffered in war from the Lithuanians and who did not know our history, and so they wrote whatever they liked about Lithuania or they used the works of the Polish clergy who supported their prejudices.¹⁵

In reality Poška borrowed the old medieval sources of Długosz, Krömer, Strykowski, and others and merely edited them for his purposes. He criticized the medieval authors when they disparaged the Lithuanians. Otherwise, he relied on them. Feeling he did not have the academic preparation for it, Poška wanted someone like Lelewel to write an updated, dispassionate, and critical history of Lithuania. He wanted a secular history without religious legends or prejudices, and he wanted a history without the intolerance shown to the “barbarian” Lithuanians.

Poška considered himself an assistant to the real historians. He knew the language, customs, geography, and ethnography, which many of the historians at the University of Vilnius had distanced themselves from. Like Daukantas, Poška felt he had an inborn knowledge of Lithuania’s past. Unfortunately, like Daukantas, Poška created his own version of comparative linguistics, whereby he would attribute Latin origins to Lithuanian words that sounded similar. He also mistakenly assumed that the Gerulians and the Herulians were the same people, and much like Daukantas he considered the Herulians the ancestors of the Lithuanians. It is interesting how Poška ap-

proached the search for historical truth. In the argument between Lelewel and Bohusz about the origins of the Lithuanians, Poška wrote a poem¹⁶ in which he rambles in the Samogitian dialect about how proud the Samogitians should be that their language is of interest to such scholars. Overall, he did not know whom to believe, and whereas he expected Lelewel to write the definitive Lithuanian history, Poška feared that Lelewel was not sufficiently sympathetic to the Lithuanians to do justice to their history. But before writing anything, Poška thought that scholars like Lelewel and Bohusz should reach a consensus because scholarly disputes were counterproductive to the Lithuanian and Samogitian causes.

Other than giving the twentieth-century reader an insight into the beginnings of Lithuanian historiography, Poška has no value as a historian. For instance Lelewel had rejected the Palemon myth, whereas Daukantas never fully rejected the myth, he doubted its validity. The only serious historian to hold on to this legend was Narbutt. Like Narbutt before him, Poška believed in the classical origins of Lithuanian paganism. Referring to classical and Christian legends, Poška believed so long as "the wolves did not suckle Palemon, so long as the moon was not his brother and he did not fight dragons...."¹⁷ then Palemon was good enough to be the first historical ruler of Lithuania. Similarly, he did not consider it a sin to believe that the Lithuanians were the descendants of Noah, though he did not think there was any historical basis for it.¹⁸ However, while not showing any overt anti-Polish prejudices, Poška here too, makes fun of the legendary forerunner of the Piasts, the wicked Popiel who was eaten by mice. In other words, the Poles have no business criticizing Lithuania's mythologized history because the Poles also use legends to explain their early history. Paradoxically, Poška denounced distorting history for national purposes, and he called for the writing of an objective history. For Poška, however, historical objectivity was satisfied so long as there were no miracles in history and so long as the history was favorable to the Lithuanians. Above all, Poška resented the word barbarian when applied to medieval Lithuanians. Poška presented all sorts of evidence to show the high level of Lithuania's civilization. For instance, Poška believed that before Lithuania's christening in 1387,

Scholars know that the Lithuanians and Samogitians had their own writing, or an alphabet, also their own literature and numbering system, which is now called the runic system of writing, but because the printing press had not yet been invented the manuscripts did not survive.¹⁹

Yet, there is very little evidence of a written Lithuanian language before the appearance of Martynas Mažvydas's *Catechism* in 1547.²⁰

In his *Thoughts of a village farmer* Poška presents his philosophy of history. In it he wrote that, "every conscious person has in his spirit and blood the innate desire first of all to know his nation and his nation's history...but he must first know his parent's language."²¹ For all of his statements about writing an objective history, he also thought that history should serve a patriotic purpose and that it should serve the nation's interests. In this Poška echoed the ideas of leading Polish intellectuals like Stanisław Staszic, Lelewel and Hugo Kołłątaj.²² "Every person according to his abilities has a duty to serve the nation and the public in some fashion."²³ Poška also felt that, "let God reward those who wish us well...but let damnation fall on the heads of those who slander us."²⁴ Poška had no idea what Lithuania would be, but he knew that it had once been a large Grand Duchy. He also made no references to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, only to Lithuania. He did not have the clear Lithuanian national sentiments of Daukantas, but he was more Lithuanian than Mickiewicz.

Poška's biographer, Michał Brensztejn, labeled him a "regionalista żmudzki" [a local Samogitian],²⁵ that is, a Pole with a local provincial character. The fact that Poška wrote primarily in Polish and did not hate Poles does not mean that he belonged to that group of Poles who like Mickiewicz and Narbutt believed Lithuania was dead. Much like Daukantas, Poška encouraged the use of the Lithuanian language and the writing of a Lithuanian history with Lithuanian interests in mind. Unlike Daukantas, Poška did not mind if a Pole like Lelewel wrote Lithuania's history, nor did Poška have any agenda to replace the Polish language in scholarship, but Poška demanded that any future historian writing about Lithuania not malign it.²⁶ Poška believed that only someone who knew the language and, more importantly, had a feel for the country could write the history of Lithuania. History should be written from within. He believed

Lithuania's history should have "a Lithuanian citizenship and patriotic spirit to it."²⁷ And yet he had an intuitive understanding that a new "scientific" history was needed to educate the peasants. Other than Daukantas, no one in the Samogitian movement dared dissociate himself from Poland and its culture. Of course, living in a time before Lithuanian nationalism, he could not foresee a Lithuania separated from Poland. Yet, Poška's concerns were solely with Lithuanian culture, language and history and not with Poland.

JUCEVIČIUS

The last of the transitional figures in Lithuanian historiography was Liudvikas Jucevičius (Pol.: Jucewicz, 1813-1846) who like the others came from the petty szlachta. The family's last name was originally Jucius, but for reasons of status the family changed it to Jucewicz. Typical of the Samogitian szlachta, his parents forbade him to play with the serfs. In and outside the home Jucevičius used Polish. After graduating from the College of Kražiai, Jucevičius studied medicine at the University of Vilnius (1829-31). While the spirit of Mickiewicz, Daukantas, and Stanevičius still dominated the university, others like Lelewel and Onacewicz had left. A new generation of scholars and students began to make their mark at the University of Vilnius. The famous Polish writer Józef Kraszewski (1812-1887), the poet and translator Franciszek Zatorski (1800-1849), and the future editor of several Warsaw newspapers Hipolit Skimbrowicz (1815-1880), although not as strong intellectually as the earlier generation of the twenties, were nevertheless an active group of academics. All this became irrelevant when in the wake of the 1831 insurrection, the Tsar closed the University of Vilnius in 1832, cutting short many academic careers. Jucevičius continued his studies in what was left of the University of Vilnius in the Vilnius Theological Academy. In 1838 he became the vicar in the Švenčionys (Pol.: Śwęciany) parish. Because of a love affair, he converted to Orthodoxy to legitimize his wife and child.

Essentially apolitical, Jucevičius did not participate in the 1831 Insurrection. As a writer he was primarily a translator and a poet. His first published work in 1834 was an anthology of Russian poetry in Polish translation. His *Writings* do not present anything particularly

new or interesting except one quote in which he states that “the Poles and the Lithuanians having rejected their old and natural customs, have assumed French culture, and that is why this historical disaster took place, the only alternative—a common road with Russia’s Tsar.”²⁸ This short comment would come back to haunt him. Later in life he completely rejected the idea of having the Lithuanians merge with the Russians.

Although known as a translator, his Lithuanian translations of Mickiewicz’s *Konrad Wallenrod* and Kraszewski’s *Witolorauda* (a series of Lithuanian legends) have been lost. He published *Historya litewska dla dzieci* [Lithuanian History for Children] in 1836, *Wyjątki z nowoczesnych poetów polskich, tłumaczone na języka litewski* [Excerpts from the New Polish poets, Translated into Lithuanian] in 1837, *Przysłowia ludu litewskiego* [Lithuanian folk proverbs] in 1840, *Pieśni Litewski* [Lithuanian songs] in 1844, and a voluminous quantity of articles published in *Tygodnik Petersburski*, *Piśmiennictwo Krajowe*, and in Kraszewski’s edited *Athenaeum*. In his *Excerpts from the New Polish poets*, Jucevičius included an introduction that he later repeated and edited in his other works. The introduction, “Several words about the language and literature of the Lithuanians,” assesses the status of the Lithuanian language:

All enlightened nations starting from the oldest times have made enormous progress in perfecting their language. Only here in Lithuania.... After our Christening and union with Poland, palaces no longer used the Lithuanian language, and the people stopped using it because the priests who arrived to teach the word of God did not know our language...our people wanted to conform to the new ways, and so they adopted [Polish] customs and language and began to disparage our own. In this way the Lithuanian language lost its life, and only the lower classes spoke it.... I do not know why it is so that such a harmonious, such a correct and grammatically perfect language has attracted so few admirers.²⁹

After such a pessimistic start, Jucevičius included the names of some of the activists who were trying to save the Lithuanian language, such as Bohusz, Kristijonas Donelaitis (1714-1780, the father of secular Lithuanian literature), Rhesa, Stanevičius, Geidroyć and many more.

Later on he writes to Józef Kraszewski that "there is a new group of Lithuanians whose ideas are modern...and who talk about your *Witolorausda* as a true national epic."³⁰ One should not attach a great deal of significance to an occasionally used phrase whose context time may have obscured, but Jucevičius's reference to a new generation of modern Lithuanians may be significant. In another letter to Kraszewski, Jucevičius writes how only a "real Lithuanian-Samogitian" can appreciate *Witolorausda*.³¹ Although Jucevičius maintained many of the older notions about the use of the Polish language and the role of the Union of Lublin, Jucevičius started to realize that the "new Lithuanians" were not the "muzhiks" but the "learned Samogitians" who were using the Lithuanian language for culturally nationalist purposes. Jucevičius also ends his "Several words" with a call to action to get rid of the old notions about language (Polish) and start using their own language.³² This isolated village priest may have inadvertently heralded the Lithuanian national rebirth.

As a historian he does not differ from many of the other dilettantes of his time. His most lasting contribution to historiography may have been as a source for Kraszewski's *Litwa and Wilno od początków jego do roku 1750* [Vilnius from Its Beginnings to 1750], Baliński's *Starożytna Polska* [Ancient Poland], Brückner's *Starożytna Litwa* [Ancient Lithuania], and Siemieński's *Podania i legendy polskie, ruskie i litewskie* [Polish, Russian and Lithuanian legends and Traditions]. However some consider him the first ethnographer of Lithuania. Historiographically, his most significant work is *Litwa pod względem starożytnych zabytków, obyczajów i zwyczajów, skreslona przez Ludwika z Pokiewia* [Lithuania with regard to its ancient ruins, traditions and customs by Ludwik from Pokiew]. In *Lithuania with regard to its ancient ruins*, much like Stanevičius, Poška and Daukantas before him, Jucevičius explains why Lithuania's history remains either unknown or distorted. He writes that,

struggles with the Poles, Teutonic Knights and herding the Tatars—that was our only trade, but to write down their deeds in books...they did not want to or maybe they were not clever enough...that is why our history has come down to us mouth to mouth and it is distorted...as for previous ages the clergy hated everything that was remotely pagan, and they kept quiet about the brave or honor-

able deed of the pagans, and sometimes they purposely destroyed or distorted the deeds of our forefathers.³³

Much as in his "Several words," Jucevičius mentions a movement in *Lithuania with regard to its ancient ruins*: "Recently a movement of young people has started shoveling through mounds of books in monasteries...which have been left to the moths and mold...searching for our fatherland's history."³⁴ Jucevičius's use of the word fatherland has a different nuance than Mickiewicz's use of the same word. It is more Samogitian and rural. Although Jucevičius extols the virtues of using the Polish language, he always considers it a foreign language. Jucevičius could not imagine a Lithuania separated from Poland; he, however, often blames the Poles for distorting his fatherland's history. Only Lithuanians who understand the language and have close ties to the countryside and know the customs and traditions can write a history of Lithuania objectively. Poška's earlier stated themes of writing an insider's Lithuanian history and preserving the language kept reappearing. Only scholars who had close ties to the Lithuanian peasantry could preserve and promote its use. Jucevičius was not excluding Poles from his concept of a Lithuanian but he might have initiated the exclusion of the szlachta. Jucevičius combined the concepts of nationality and class.

Jucevičius writes about virtually everything imaginable in his *Lithuania with regard to its ancient ruins*; from tales of witches, to kites, to medicine, to food, to mermaids, to how to divine the future and to all things Christian and pagan that made up ethnographic life. Jucevičius's documentation was erratic. He often cited Narbutt or Lelewel, but unfortunately he mingles the works of nineteenth century historians with medieval and Renaissance chroniclers, so that a citation from Narbutt was merely a retelling of the older Italian chronicler Alexander Guagnini's (1538-1614) *Sarmatiae Europaeae Descriptio*, which in turn Guagnini took from the chronicles of the ever-present Strykowski. He often used secondary sources, and sometimes he plagiarized, as in the case of a chapter in his *Lithuania in regard to its ancient ruins* entitled "Some old customs and rituals," which was from the Russian ethnographer Ivan Borishevsky's article "Information about Ancient Lithuanians."³⁵ In another instance he took the Belarus songs of Jan Czeczot (1796-1847) and used them as examples

of Lithuanian folk songs. Often Jucevičius is an objective eyewitness, but at other times he embellishes the story. His approach to mythology was more modest than Narbutt's. Jucevičius did not search for a system to integrate Roman-Lithuanian mythology. He was an amateur archeologist who used no method in trying to preserve or excavate carefully. Nevertheless, because he was so close to the peasantry, Jucevičius understood them better than those who had acquired foreign refinement from the universities.

Although there is no evidence that Jucevičius knew the works of Herder, some of Jucevičius's ideas seem as though they come straight out of Herder's *Ideas on the Philosophy of the History of Mankind*. Jucevičius believed that the peasantry embodied the national character. The peasants were the only true Lithuanians. "So let us go under the villager's roof, let us get to know these people, today the down-trodden and inhumanly exploited but worthy of great honor. Only there will you find the real pure Lithuanians, and only there will you find out about our forefathers."³⁶ In contrast, the szlachta has changed its nationality several times. "Depending on which way the wind blows, the Lithuanian upper classes have changed their nationality."³⁷ They went from Lithuanian to Polish and then to imitating French culture.

Jucevičius did not have Stanevičius's or Daukantas's breadth of learning, but he was not completely ignorant of the wider world around him. He did not use the vocabulary of class consciousness nor did he have a plan for class struggle. Nevertheless, in several of his sermons he chastised the upper classes for their extravagance.³⁸ One cannot find a clear Lithuania national identity among the works of Jucevičius. Nor can one find the history of a Lithuanian state. Even when writing about the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, he writes only in passing about the training of soldiers or the weapons they use. Frequently he used such terms as Samogitians, Lithuanian-Samogitians or "real" Lithuanians interchangeably. Jucevičius included the Old Prussians and Old Couronians in his works about Lithuania and Samogitia. Where Daukantas saw the history of a nation and a state, Jucevičius saw the history of a class of people who embodied the nation. The new Lithuanians would lead the peasantry in a struggle for language and economic rights against the szlachta. Again it must be emphasized that Jucevičius was not a revolutionary.

As for a state Jucevičius could not imagine anything other than the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. But the Commonwealth was irrelevant to his ethnographic interests.

Before the Samogitian national movement only the szlachta belonged to the concept of a political nation. Samogitian writers like Daukantas, however, believed the Lithuanian nation had always existed. He wanted to make them proud of their history. In his writings, he made peasants into members of the Lithuanian nation. The peasants would no longer be citizens of an idyllic Commonwealth. Jucevičius replaced civic patriotism with ethnic, and historical identity. Much like Daukantas, Jucevičius thought that the Lithuanians had always existed and that they had been pure until foreigners contaminated them.

* * *

The historiographer can include more writers and activists in the historiographic gap that exists between Daukantas and the appearance of *Auszra* in 1883. Ławryn Iwiński (1810-1881), another Samogitian petty boyar, published Lithuanian calendars in which he included historical events of the day, in effect creating a history and literature almanac. Iwiński's calendars were in fact Lithuanian periodicals. Another one of Jucevičius's learned Samogitians was Kajetan Niezabitowski (1800-1876). Allegedly, he wrote a very extensive Polish-Lithuanian dictionary, a Lithuania-Samogitian grammar, and a large history of Lithuania and Samogitia. Unfortunately most of his manuscripts were lost in Poland during World War II. Others Samogitians wrote sacred histories. Occasionally, the only thing that could identify a Lithuanian writer was the Lithuanian language itself. Some writers wrote histories for children that the authors intended as primers. Still other historians like Michał Baliński contributed substantially to the development of Lithuanian historiography. Born near Vilnius and educated at the University of Vilnius, he edited with the help of Simonas Stanevičius *Wielkie Księztwo Litewskie* [The Grand Duchy of Lithuania], the fourth volume of Baliński's *Starżytna Polska* [Ancient Poland]. Baliński was a more critical historian than Narbutt and in that sense a better historian.³⁹ Nevertheless, Baliński

remained a Pole, whereas for all of Narbutt's flaws, there was something of an insider's quality about his history. It seems that in the case of Lithuania's undeveloped historiography, dispassion made for a better historian but a less intense nationalist.

Mykolas Akelaitis (Pol.: Mikołaj Akielewicz, 1829-1887) a journalist, translator, and grammar school teacher was a member of the Union of Polish Democrats. During the 1863 insurrection the Provisional Government appointed him the civil commissar of the Augustów canton. He was a multifaceted personality, who would eventually submit articles to *Ausra*, which automatically stamps him a Lithuanian nationalist. And yet in 1864 he wrote a manifesto in Lithuanian proclaiming "Poland is our fatherland."⁴⁰ He even advocated a Pan-slavism, that would include the Lithuanians but not the Russians. He lived for a while with Daukantas, and he corresponded prodigiously with Kraszewski. Akelaitis wrote one of the most extensive Lithuanian grammar books, *Gramatyka języka litewskiego*. Quite obviously, this multi-talented individual could also write history. In 1862 he finished but never published *Opisanie Wielkie Xsięstwo Litewskiego*. [A Description of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania]. In Lithuanian he wrote *Lietuvos Budvieti*, which he did not publish until translating it in 1885 under the title *Rzut oka na starożytność narodu litewskiego* [A Glance at the Ancient History of the Lithuanian Nation] using the pseudonym Vytautas. It was forty-five pages long. For all of Akelaitis's activities, his histories give the reader no hint about which side he was leaning toward. Would he join the *Ausra* nationalists or would he be Polish? One can only guess whether Akelaitis would have severed his close ties with the Poles.

Even before *Ausra*'s appearance in 1883, Jucevičius's "new Lithuanians" would have to make a choice between being "a pure Lithuanian" or a Pole. The old dictum of "gente Lithuanus natione Polonus" seemed out of date by the mid-century. The key question for the new Lithuanians was whether Lithuania's history had ended. Mickiewicz, Narbutt, and Kraszewski wrote about a political nation of the szlachta that died with the partitions. Stanevičius and Jucevičius believed in a peasant nation that had lost its political and cultural primacy to foreigners, but they still believed in the peasant nation's survival. Daukantas went the farthest because he saw not only a peasant nation but also a political military state of the medieval Grand

Dukes who had a legitimate history that could compete in grandeur with its surrounding neighbors. Poška and Jucevičius did not have the education or clearly defined militancy of Daukantas. Even though their educational levels differed, more connects these three Samogitians intellectually and spiritually than divides them.

The separation of a Lithuanian national consciousness from a Polish national consciousness was inevitable. Old selfish feudal separatist goals, however, would not dictate that separation. Differences in social class, language and psychology would determine that separation. Though they both mean "fatherland," for the new Lithuanians *Tėvynė* would eventually replace *Ojczyzna*. There is nothing indefinable or mystical about the meaning of these two words. The early Lithuanistics movement activists intentionally chose to feel Lithuanian. They expressed their emotions in the Polish language, but based on their imagined history, the Lithuanians of the early and mid nineteenth century were well on their way to seeing more qualitative differences between themselves and the Poles.

NOTES

1. Römer, *Litwa*, 32.

2. *Wiadomości biograficzne i literackie o ucznionych żmudzinach* [Biographical and Literary Information about the Learned Samogitians]. The complete book made its appearance in 1975 in Lithuanian translation as Liudvikas Jucevičius, *Mokyti Žemaičiai* [Learned Samogitians] (Vilnius: Vaga, 1975).

3. In his *Mokyti Žemaičiai* Jucevičius asked Simonas Daukantas to publish his *Samogitian History*. *Ibid.*, 59. Evidently Jucevičius knew of Daukantas's work, but had not read them. Daukantas's influence on the Samogitian national movement seems to have been minimal.

4. *Ibid.*, 97.

5. The most important lost manuscript was Kajetan Niezabitowski's three volume Polish language *History of Lithuania and Samogitia*. He knew the Lithuanian language well and Dionizas Poška considered him a critical historian.

6. Ksawier Bohusz, *O początkach narodu i języka litewskiego* [About the beginnings of the Lithuanian nation and language] (Warsaw: Gazeta Warszawska, 1808), 206. Bohusz made an interesting observation on the state of the Lithuanian language. He wrote that Lithuania had not lost its name, "but the language is disappearing. The ordinary people are forced to learn Polish so that the lord can understand him. The lord no longer understands Lithuanian. This means that ordinary people speak Lithuanian among themselves and Polish on the estate.... If only the writers would use the Lithuanian language,

then they could save it, but Lithuanian writers write in Polish and Latin so that foreigners can understand them.”

7. Joachim Lelewel, *Uwagi nad rozprawą Ksawiera Bohusza o początku narodu i języka litewskiego* [Comments on Ksawier Bohusz's 'About the Beginnings of the Lithuanian Nation and Language'] (Warsaw: Dabrowski, 1809), 55.

8. Bohusz, *O początkach narodu i języka litewskiego*, 2.

9. Vladas Zukas, *Lietuvių knygotyros bruožai* [The character of Lithuanian book research] (Vilnius: Moksas, 1989), 18.

10. Dionizas Poška, *Mužikas Žiemaycziu yr Lietuwos* [A Samogitian and Lithuanian peasant], in *Raštai* [Writings], J. Kruopas et al., eds. (Vilnius: Valstybinė Grožinės Literatūros Leidykla, 1959), 21.

11. Adam Mickiewicz, *Pan Tadeusz* (Warsaw: Czytelnik, 1991), 103.

12. Worth noting is his letter to the Samogitian Bishop Józef Giedroyc. It is the only surviving Lithuanian prose written by Poška. Although the letter is torn and the last letter of his name is missing, one can see that he used the Lithuanian version of his name Poszk[a] instead of Paszkiewicz.

13. Vytautas Merkys, "Teksto Komentarai" [Commentary on the Text], in Simonas Daukantas, *Raštai* [Writings], vol. 1 (Vilnius: Vaga), 743.

14. Dionizas Poška, *Rosmyślanie Wieśniaka Rolnika*, in *Raštai*, 267.

15. D. P. Żmudzin, *Kilka Słów Przedwstępnych do Kogobaż Mającego Zamiar Pisać Dzieje Litwy i Żmudzi*, in *Ibid.*, 261.

16. Dionizas Poška, "Pas Kuniga Xawiera Bohusza Lietuwi, Yr Jokima Leleweli Mozura" [By Father Xavier Bohusz a Lithuanian and Joachim Lelewel a Mazurian], in *Raštai*, 48.

17. Poška, *Rosmyślanie Wieśniaka Rolnika*, 324.

18. *Ibid.*, 263.

19. Ksawier Bohusz may have been the originator of this. Poška accepted Bohusz's writings as fact. *Ibid.*, 279.

20. Some books written in Latin and Polish before 1547 have Lithuanian annotations in the margins. Some of the sixteenth-century chroniclers took notes in Lithuanian.

21. Poška, *Rosmyślanie Wieśniaka Rolnika*, 263.

22. Staszic (1755-1826): philosopher, geologist, pioneer in the fields of economic and scientific development; he became a patriot and republican. Kołłątaj (1750-1812): priest and prominent in the movement for national regeneration following the First Partition of Poland in 1772. Lelewel will be discussed in more detail later.

23. *Ibid.*, 271.

24. *Ibid.*, 265.

25. Michał Brensztejn, *Dionizy Paszkiewicz: Pisarz Polsko-Litewski na Żmudzi* [Dionizas Poška. A Polish-Lithuanian writer in Samogitia] (Vilnius: Św. Wojciecha, 1934), 88.

26. D. P. Żmudzin, *Kilka Słów Przedwstępnych*, 261.

27. Vytautas Vanagas, *Dionizas Poška* (Vilnius: Pradai, 1994), 128.

28. Liudvikas Jucevičius, *Pisma Ludwika Adama Jucewicza* [The writings of Ludwik Adam Jucewicz], quoted in Introduction by M. Lukšienė, "Liudvikas Adomas Jucevičius," Liudvikas Adomas Jucevičius, *Raštai* [Writings], M. Lukšienė and et al., eds.; trans. D. Urbas, (Vilnius: Valstybinė Grožinės Literatūros Leidykla, 1959), 13.

29. Jucevičius, "Kilka słów o języku i literaturze litewskiej" [Several words about the language and literature of the Lithuanians], in *Ibid.*, 62.

30. Jucevičius, "Letter to Józef Kraszewski, 20 January 1841, Svėdasai," in *Ibid.*, 577.
31. Jucevičius, "Letter to Józef Kraszewski, 19 April 1839, Švenčionys," in *Ibid.*, 569.
32. Jucevičius, "Kilka słów," in *Ibid.*, 72.
33. Jucevičius, *Litwa pod względem starożytnych zabytków*, in *Ibid.*, 57.
34. *Ibid.*, 56.
35. Meilė Lukšienė, "Liudvikas Adomas Jucevičius," in *Ibid.*, 33.
36. Jucevičius, *Litwa pod względem starożytnych zabytków*, 57. No one has made a direct link between the works of Zorian Dołęga Chodakowski (1784-1825) and the works of Jucevičius. Nevertheless several sentences in *Litwa pod względem starożytnych zabytków* seem plagiarized straight out of Chodakowski's *O sławiańszczyźnie przed chrześcijaństwem* [On Prechristian Slavdom], ed. Julian Maślanka (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1967), 24. As the father of Polish and Ukrainian ethnography, he and his book must have been noticed by many Lithuanians. Chodakowski's works would have been more accessible to Jucevičius than Herder's works.
37. *Ibid.*, 185.
38. Lukšienė, "Liudvikas Adomas Jucevičius," in *Ibid.*, 18.
39. Irena Petrauskienė, "Lietuvos Istorijos Tyrinėtojas" [A researcher of Lithuania's history], *Mokslas ir gyvenimas*, 125, no. 2 (1968): 34-36.
40. *Žinia Apej Lenku Wajna su Maskolejs* [News about the Polish War with the Muscovites] Augustów: February 1, 1864, in Stefan Kieniewicz et al., eds., *Powstanie Styczniowe: Materiały i Dokumenty*, part 4, *Prasa Tajna z Lat 1861-1864* (Wrocław: Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1970), 195. Some consider this manifesto the first Lithuanian language newspaper. In reality it was Akielewicz's translation from Polish, and it was just an underground manifesto.

V

THE WORLD OF SIMONAS DAUKANTAS AND THE BEGINNINGS OF LITHUANIAN HISTORICISM

...two methods have to be followed simultaneously in the approach to historical truth: the first is the exact, impartial, critical investigation of events: the second in the connecting of the events explored and the intuitive understanding of them which could not be reached by the first means.

WILHELM VON HUMBOLDT

The first person to write a history in the Lithuanian language was Simonas Daukantas (Pol.: Szymon Dowkont, 1793-1864).¹ Born of a free peasant family in Samogitia² and educated at the University of Vilnius, he was a student of Joachim Lelewel. Daukantas graduated in 1825, but before the University gave him a Master's degree in law he had to present documents proving his noble birth. Although solitary and largely unpublished in his own life time, the father of Lithuanian history was a forerunner of the Lithuanian national rebirth.³

While still a student at Vilnius, Daukantas wrote his first history *Darbai senųjų lietuvių ir žemaičių* [Deeds of the Old Lithuanians and Samogitians] in 1822. In Riga he finished his *Istorija žemaitiška* [A Samogitian History] in 1838, but it was published in the United States in two parts in 1893 and 1897. His third and possibly most important work, *Būdas senovės lietuvių kalnėnų ir žemaičių* [The Character of the Old Lithuanians, Highlanders and Samogitians], was a cultural history and the only history published in his lifetime in 1845. He finished his fourth history in 1850 but it went unpublished until 1893; *Pasakojimas apie veikalus lietuvių tautos senovėje* [A Tale about the Deeds of the Old Lithuanian Nation] was a revision of his *Samogitian History*. Besides these histories he wrote books dealing with folklore, songs, a Lithuanian-Latin dictionary, a three volume Polish-Lithuanian dictionary, translations of classic fables as well as a Lithuanian version of Robinson Crusoe.

After graduating from the University of Vilnius, Daukantas spent ten years in Riga as a governor-general's translator and then fifteen years in St. Petersburg working in the Senate office and archives. Before starting his career as a civil servant in Riga in 1825 he spent some time in the Königsberg archives. In spite of living outside of Lithuania for so long, Daukantas remained a product of the cultural and academic atmosphere of early nineteenth-century Vilnius.

By the late nineteenth century, the new Lithuanians considered themselves more Lithuanian than the Polonized gentry, thereby contesting the label of who a Lithuanian was. Nearly all the activists of the Lithuanian rebirth were multilingual, and privately spoke and wrote in Polish.⁴ While identifying with the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, these Lithuanian patriots did not want to continue the relationship that had existed under the old Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Because they perceived Lithuania as a nation rather than a part of a heterogeneous Polish federated state, the attitudes of the Lithuanian nationalists began to differ from the Polish inhabitants of eastern Lithuania. Lithuanian writers had to prove to themselves and the Poles that the Lithuanians had a different language, folklore, history, and customs. Daukantas was the first conscious Lithuanian nationalist to see Lithuania with a future.⁵ Daukantas's histories were not about a territory but about what he thought was a living nation. Not seeing a direct connection between themselves and the emerging ethno-linguistic Lithuanians, Poles like Mickiewicz wrote about a Lithuania that no longer existed—the Grand Duchy of Lithuania as a part of the Commonwealth.

Early nineteenth-century eastern Lithuania was neither today's Vilnius nor Piłsudski's Wilno of the 1890's or the inter-war period. At a time before modern nationalism, labeling Vilnius as a Polish or a Lithuanian city is meaningless. Vilnius's diversity blurred the modern components of nationality such as language and geography. Vilnius was a cosmopolitan city dominated by the Polish language but also including Belarusin and Yiddish elements. Though formerly the capital of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Vilnius had few residents who spoke Lithuanian as their native tongue. One can only guess what the Polish-speaking population felt about their identity. No doubt a regional identity made them Lithuanians, but they did not think about a modern Lithuanian ethnic nation-state. One should note that some-

one of Belarusin origin who spoke only Polish, as a resident of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania would consider himself a Lithuanian and a Pole. Metaphorically, Mickiewicz embodies the national dilemma of this region. Born in Belarus, he wrote about Lithuania as his fatherland in the Polish language. Only people who understand his historical allusions and are fluent in Polish can fully appreciate his poetry. It might be added that Lithuania and its different brand of Polishness influenced Polish-language writers as much as it did the Lithuanians like Daukantas or Valančius who wrote in Lithuanian.

Daukantas and Mickiewicz were fellow students at the University of Vilnius coming from the same intellectual milieu as well as having similar but not identical notions of Lithuania's past. As a son of Samogitia, Daukantas felt that Lithuania was alive and well and that the two linguistic, geographic and historical entities of Lithuania and Poland were not identical. Nowhere does Daukantas consider Lithuanians a "gentes" or tribe. He considered Lithuania to have been a nation from its inception. For him the Lithuanian nation was a harmonious combination of rulers and peasants who had a common language and history with the medieval Grand Duchy. Mickiewicz, however, did not see medieval or nineteenth-century Lithuanian peasants as a nation. Instead, in his poetry he portrayed an idyllic but dead nation. Building on the political separatism of the Polonized magnates like the Radziwiłłs, Daukantas introduced the dividing force of nationalism into the poet's fatherland.

Many of the influences that shaped the Lithuanian rebirth were not imported from Congress Poland but were indigenous to Lithuania. In the early nineteenth century, the University of Vilnius was arguably the best university in the Russian empire. As a Polish intellectual stronghold, its students and professors believed in the permanence of the union between Poland and Lithuania. To the luminaries of the university like the poets Adam Mickiewicz and Ignacy Kraszewski or the historians Józef Jaroszewicz and Joachim Lelewel, the Union of Lublin was sacred; they thought that Lithuania was a province of the Commonwealth. Because Daukantas came from Samogitia he must have felt foreign in Vilnius and at its University.

The University of Vilnius serviced a diverse cultural and linguistic population, including Lithuanians, Belarusins, and Poles. Although essentially a Polish University even after its elevation to the status of

an Imperial University in 1803, Latin continued to be the language of instruction. There were no special provisions made for a chair of or the use of the Polish language. A Polish chemist Jędrzej Śniadecki was the first to teach his subject in Polish. On the other hand, Marcin Poczebott, an astronomer and a former rector of the University of Vilnius (1780-1799, then called the Principal School of Lithuania), felt that the Polish language was inadequate for the sciences and mathematics and that "our Lithuanian language has ties to the Greek, Latin, Chaldean, and the Egyptian tongues"⁶ and therefore was more useful for the sciences. Mickiewicz considered the revival of the Lithuanian language worthy of study at the University, and he also thought that its roots were more ancient than those of the Polish language.⁷ When Jędrzej Śniadecki's brother Jan became the rector (1807-15), he introduced the Polish language and in 1816 Polish became the official language of instruction. Working under the supervision of Adam Czartoryski, the University of Vilnius led the way in the Polonization of most levels of education in Lithuania. The University approved of books for primary and secondary schools solely in the Polish language. By becoming a pupil in a Lithuanian school, one became a *de facto* linguistic Pole.⁸ Because most peasants could not go to school, the process of Polonization was usually limited to the *szlachta*. The Polish language, however, did serve as a vehicle for the sons of rich peasants to rise into the *szlachta*. At least in the early nineteenth century, the Polonizing process was not coercive. Just as Polonization did not threaten the identity of Lithuanians, Lithuania gave its Polish-speaking population a regional identity. Lithuanian history and culture affected Vilnius and its University, giving it a provincial flavor and its ambience an intangibly Lithuanian twist. Although Polonization did not affect the identity of the population of eastern Lithuania, it contributed to the demise of the Lithuanian language.

In 1822 the University's chief librarian, Kazimierz Kontrym (1777-1836), submitted a proposal to establish a chair in the Lithuanian language to Czartoryski; nothing, however, came of the proposal, although the University offered courses in Arabic and Persian. Of course many of the linguistic discussions about the possibility of establishing a department of Lithuanian became moot when in 1825 Russian became the official language at the University of Vilnius.

Then in 1832, Tsar Nicholas I closed it. Rather than institutions, individual Samogitians like Simonas Stanevičius, Bishop Motiejus Valančius, and Daukantas took the lead in reviving the Lithuanian language.

Although one needs to search for the start of Lithuanian historiography in a survey of medieval Slavic and German sources, the University of Vilnius was the birthplace of Lithuanian historiography. And although Vilnius had been the capital of Lithuania, its Polonization meant that it could not be a center for the Lithuanian national rebirth.⁹ Nevertheless, the researching of Lithuania's past had to start there. Historians like Joachim Lelewel, Józef Jaroszewicz, Ignacy Daniłowicz, and Ignacy Onacewicz began developing historicism and a sense of national history. In the search for the nation's origins, objective scholarship fell victim to the passionate reconstruction of a nationalist history. Indeed, thinkers like Stanisław Staszic thought that historians should write history for the youth of Poland to foster pride in the deeds of their forefathers.¹⁰ It was these Polish intellectual and political roots that created the Vilnius School of Romanticism.

Although initially there was no separate department of Lithuanian history at the University of Vilnius, professors like Tomasz Hussarzewski (1732-1807) and later his most famous student Lelewel, started to research Lithuania's history in a more scholarly fashion. Lelewel rejected the use of legends, and he demanded that historians use sources critically. Being a proponent of a scientific approach to history, Lelewel proposed to analyze his sources critically. Paradoxically, while Lelewel led the way for an increase in the professionalization of history, he lived and taught in an age of Romanticism, which as a literary movement fostered early cultural nationalism. As skeptical as Lelewel was, his patriotism required that the historian love his country and nation.¹¹

Born in Warsaw and educated in Vilnius, Joachim Lelewel (1786-1861) taught world history and did research in Polish, Lithuanian, and Russian history. Lelewel did not know Lithuanian, and he did not think it was his business to save the Lithuanian language, although he believed that those who spoke it should rescue it from extinction. Many of the inhabitants of the Grand Duchy, including Daukantas, derisively called Poles like Lelewel "crowners."¹² In a

letter to his colleague Teodor Narbutt, Daukantas commented, "as far as professor Lelewel's works are concerned, don't worry your head, you won't find anything there; he blows the same smoke as the crowners do."¹³ Although some historiographers have claimed that Lelewel was a methodological innovator in the history department at the University of Vilnius, he also romanticized history.¹⁴ He was simply more discriminating in his choice of sources. In his *Jakim ma być historyk* [What a Historian Should be Like] and *Historyka*, he laid out his philosophy of history. In these works his focus was only slightly different from that of other Romantics. He called on the need for a scientific approach to history. Nevertheless, he felt the historian had to idealize the past and raise the national consciousness.¹⁵ Lelewel required the historian to "foster love for his fatherland and nationality."¹⁶ Even though Lelewel's approach was scientific, he also accepted the notion that the Lithuanian language had similarities to Latin, which meant that the Romans and the Lithuanians might have had common origins. Daukantas and Lelewel also shared similar democratic notions about all classes making up the nation. Although many historians emphasize that Daukantas was Lelewel's student, in fact Daukantas never worked closely with Lelewel and attended very few of Lelewel's lectures. Lelewel was starting his career as a professor at a time when Daukantas was ending his career as a student. Nevertheless, Lelewel's efforts at professionalizing history greatly influenced Daukantas. In this respect, Lelewel was the father of historicism at the University of Vilnius, whereas Daukantas took that historicism and tied it closely to Lithuanian nationalism.

Ignacy Onacewicz (1780-1845) influenced Daukantas more than his other professors. From 1818-1822 Onacewicz taught world history at the University of Vilnius, where he was the first to treat the histories of Lithuania and Poland separately. More so than Lelewel, Onacewicz searched for the prehistoric origins of Lithuania, but the manuscript of his multi-volume history of Lithuania did not survive. He also did not have the same rigorous methodological standards as Lelewel. Nor did Onacewicz live up to his colleague in popularity. In addition to Onacewicz's weaknesses as a lecturer, the students did not appreciate his characterization of medieval Poles as barbarians.¹⁷ Besides Daukantas, Onacewicz's most famous student was Adam

Mickiewicz.¹⁸ Onacewicz's legacy lay in the impact he had on Mickiewicz and Daukantas, in influencing their idealized version of Lithuania's past.

The problem for Onacewicz and Daukantas was, as the Polish writer Ignacy Kraszewski stated, "we know almost nothing about Lithuania's past."¹⁹ Hardly philosophers, writers like Kraszewski and Daukantas believed that epistemologically the past might never be completely known and so therefore the historian had to use his imagination to recreate the past, often for purposes other than pure scholarship. Psychologically, history became a tool to search for one's roots and to answer the most fundamental questions such as "who am I and where do I come from?" While they did not completely eschew the search for documents, the lack of sources did not stop them from visualizing their past. Historians like Narbutt, Kraszewski, Daukantas, and Onacewicz believed that they should fill in the gaps in an incomplete historical record. Besides, research was time consuming, and they did not want to wait for the discovery of historical records that might never be found. Possibly another factor that prevented Daukantas from becoming a better historian was that he had to earn a living as a civil servant. He could not be a full-time scholar.

Perhaps the most influential Polish-language historian for Lithuanians was Teodor Narbutt (1784-1864). A military engineer, he studied mathematics and architecture at the University of Vilnius. He wrote what is still the most extensive history of Lithuania: the nine volume *Dzieje narodu litewskiego* [The History of the Lithuanian Nation] which was the first history in the Polish language to separate Lithuania's past from Poland's. Narbutt ended his work with the death of Sigismund Augustus (1572). Dramatically he wrote, "For the further account of historical events I give over to Polish historians. The last Lithuanian king died, the last to inherit the Jogaila crown...and I break my pen on his grave."²⁰

Patriotism and research bound Daukantas and Narbutt together. In their correspondence they left behind a series of letters which give insight into the Polish-Lithuanian dilemma as well as their methodology. Daukantas's correspondence with Narbutt demonstrates Daukantas's abilities as a researcher better than his histories. In these letters he writes about a list of documents and books in his possession that he did not cite in his *Samogitian History or Character*. He knew

the archives in St. Petersburg and Riga fairly well, and he recommended to Narbutis the use of documents in the archives. As much as Daukantas criticized scientific historians like Lelewel, Daukantas urged Narbutis to read Ignacy Daniłowicz's critical history of Vilnius. In his letters to Narbutis he emphasized that if the Lithuanians were going to write independently of Polish historians, they would need better methods of collecting, publishing, and analyzing sources.²¹ Daukantas did not reject an objective approach to history; he merely believed, as did most of the historians of the time, that besides serving scholarship, it should also be didactic.

Daukantas, however, developed an anti-Polish bias that led him to accuse Poles of destroying and stealing archival materials. For instance, he accused the Polish writer Julian Niemcewicz (1757-1841) of taking whatever he liked from the Radziwiłł archives as if it were his personal property.²² He was also sensitive about the Polonization of Lithuanian names. For Daukantas the *raison d'être* of Polish historiography was "to hide documents and use any means to make sure that Lithuania's history does not exist."²³ Daukantas often appears more concerned with discrediting Polish historians and their supposed anti-Lithuanian plots than with using documents critically.²⁴ In a letter to Teodor Narbutis, he told him "to publish the *Acta Lithuanorum* in Königsberg, not in Poznań...because if the Poles get hold of it, they will distort Lithuania's history just as Długosz, Krömer, and Naruszewicz did."²⁵ Several years later he wrote, "My God, everyone tries to trick us and make for eternity our history a part of the Kingdom's history."²⁶

A systematic study of Lithuanian history in the early nineteenth century was virtually impossible for Daukantas. For all of the obstacles that the mind-set of romantic nationalism created in writing a dispassionate history, practical matters such as the inaccessibility of sources and money hindered Daukantas's and Narbutis's attempts at professionalizing the writing of Lithuanian history. Daukantas did not have the benefits of state support, nor an academic bureaucracy to help him. Many of the letters between Daukantas and Narbutis deal with raising money to buy transcribed documents from impoverished scholars like Onacewicz or Daniłowicz. Without funds Daukantas and Narbutis could not by themselves organize the publication of Lithua-

nian documents. Daukantas was aware of the professionalization of history taking place in western Europe, and he wanted to organize, albeit on a very limited scale, the collection of archival sources. From his first letter to Teodor Narbutt, Daukantas called for the collection of documents which previously had been scattered or misplaced.²⁷ In his letters to Narbutt, he recommended that Narbutt research the holdings of the Vilnius, Samogitia, and Luck episcopal archives as well as those of the monastery archives of Lithuania and Belarus. He realized that not all documents had equal value as sources for Lithuania's history. He wanted Narbutt to publish only the original texts of authentic documents. Often Daukantas would urge caution in publishing documents whose authenticity he suspected. Daukantas also realized the limitations of doing research in Russian archives. For instance, Narbutt had plans of sailing to St. Petersburg to see the "Lithuanian Metrics" in the public library, but Daukantas wrote to Narbutt, "Your trip will be useless, because they do not let anyone near the manuscripts."²⁸ In trying to answer the question of what happened in the past, Daukantas had to deal with questions such as where are the sources, what archives will allow us access, and how much money does it take to get there? Unlike Daukantas, historians from large nations like Russia had state bureaucracies sponsoring their research and writing. But for Daukantas, Lithuanian history was a lonely, unprofitable, and frustrating task, which he nevertheless pursued with his heart and soul.

Because Daukantas's primary goal was reconstructing Lithuania's past and idealizing it, Daukantas did not engage in a great deal of analysis of the sources favorable to Lithuania. Yet, when dealing with Polish interpretations of Lithuania's history, Daukantas could be critical. Daukantas found quite a few mistakes in Polish historiography. Modern historians have even corroborated some of Daukantas's seemingly fanciful tales.²⁹ The mistakes that Daukantas found seem trivial, but for him they proved Polish duplicity. For instance, Daukantas claimed that the editors purposely changed the date of the first mention of Lithuania's name from 1009 to 1090 in Narbutt's manuscript.³⁰ In his mixture of a critical and romantic approach to history, Daukantas more than any other Lithuanian historian of the nineteenth century, embodied the goals and shortcomings of historicism.

Having lost their homeland in the three partitions, Daukantas and Narbutt had a similar political agenda of non-acceptance of Russian rule. Although similar in their glorification of Lithuania's history, there are some subtle differences between these two dreamers, which reflect the difference between the older Polish-Lithuanian civic patriotism of a territorial Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the new emerging ethno-linguistic Lithuanian nationalism. Both fancied themselves as patriots of pagan Lithuania, but Daukantas was also a citizen of the Duchy of Samogitia.³¹ Because Samogitia was less Polonized, Daukantas felt himself more pure in his Lithuanianism than the Polonized Lithuanians of eastern Lithuania. Narbutt faulted the Poles for Lithuania's political demise whereas Daukantas blamed the Poles for the national and moral enslavement of Lithuania.³² Where Narbutt saw a state made up of the szlachta, Daukantas saw a nation made up of the peasantry. Daukantas's concept of Lithuania was more nationalist and more anti-aristocratic than Narbutt's. Even though he wrote in Polish, Narbutt could be just as vehement in his anti-Polishness as Daukantas. Many Lithuanian-Poles like Mickiewicz thought the Union of Lublin was the defining moment for both Lithuania and Poland that created a brotherhood of two nations, but Narbutt thought that, "Lithuania before the Union flourished, whereas after the Union, Lithuania became bogged down in Polish anarchy."³³

Narbutt and Daukantas shared books and information about their research. They even called each other "my fellow countryman." The question remains why Narbutt did not take the final step and write in Lithuanian? Of course, the intelligentsia read Polish, and Narbutt did not know Lithuanian very well. Yet, more important than the practical considerations of publishing in Polish, Narbutt believed that with the Union of Lublin in 1569, Lithuania's history had ended. Narbutt's letters to Daukantas have a pathetic quality in which Narbutt lamented the decline of Lithuania whereas Daukantas accentuated the positive—Lithuania and its languages (dialects) were alive, beautiful, and useful for scholarship.³⁴ Ironically, Narbutt's works were too anti-Polish to be received favorably by the Polish reading public, and because they were written in Polish, the Lithuanian rebirth activists preferred Daukantas's works. Narbutt became the forgotten historian whose works are only now coming into fashion in Lithuanian translation.

Methodologically, Daukantas lagged behind the Poles of the University of Vilnius like Józef Jaroszewicz, Ignacy Daniłowicz, and Joachim Lelewel. Even Daukantas's fellow Samogitians—Bishop Motiejus Valančius and Simonas Stanevičius—were more critical scholars. By choosing to draw closer to Teodor Narbutt and the Vilnius Romantic school of historiography, Daukantas eschewed a critical assessment of his own nation's past.³⁵ Daukantas used footnotes erratically, and retracing his research is very difficult. Often Daukantas seems like a compiler of previously written histories. For instance in his *Deeds* he repeatedly used Kotzebue's *Preussens aeltere Geschichte* and Kojalowicz's *Historiae Lituanæ*; a quarter of the citations in his *Samogitian History* are from Voigt's nine-volume *Geschichte Preussens*. At times, he blatantly plagiarized from Kojalowicz's, Voigt's, and Kotzebue's histories. In spite of his dislike for Strykowski, whom he called "that blabbermouth," Daukantas often cited him. He knew most of the sources available to scholars of that time. Daukantas either selectively used those sources or did what he accused the "crowners" of doing, that is, interpreting those sources tendentiously.

He was a well-read person, having a knowledge and love of the classics: he often quoted from Pliny, Tacitus, Herodotus, Ptolemy, Machiavelli, and a host of other writers and often compared Lithuania's history with classical history. Borrowing from Strykowski he considered Vytautas and Kęstutis comparable to Achilles or Hector. In the preface to the *Deeds* he wrote,

Readers may question,...that I praise the Lithuanians and Samogitians, while I criticize the deeds of the warlike Christians as immoral. But if the Romans and Greeks—even though they were pagans—today are honored by all Christians for their virtue and patience, then why should not the Lithuanians and Samogitians be praised, if they too loved virtue and hated immorality?³⁶

Sometimes one gets the impression that he was showing off his erudition, which a Lithuanian of peasant origin was not suppose to have. Having read the works of Hugo Grotius, Samuel Pufendorf, Bonnot de Mably, Algernon Sidney, and others who analyzed the nature of sovereignty, he believed a nation was an association of free people. In his search for the origins of the Lithuanians he most frequently

referred to Tacitus's *Germania*. Therein lies one of Daukantas's failings as a historian: virtually all the barbarian tribes had contacts with the Lithuanians and were in turn influenced by the Lithuanians. Daukantas even mentions Attila the Hun as once having needed the help of the Herulians—the mythical ancestors of the Lithuanians.³⁷ Western erudition was not a weak spot, but archeology and history were.

One must remember that the historical predecessor to the Age of Romanticism was the Age of the Enlightenment, which stressed that the historian use primary materials critically and objectively. Daukantas and the Vilnius romantics knew this quite well.³⁸ But because Daukantas thought that Lithuania did not have its own ancient sources, he believed that tendentious Polish and German chronicles dominated Lithuania's historiography. He therefore needed to rely on other sources. In searching for his nation's spirit, Daukantas could also use an intuitive approach to history, which further led to an uncritical interpretation of history. In addition, Daukantas also embellished his works with peasant Samogitian proverbs and a subjectivity that makes it seem as if Daukantas were an eyewitness to the events about which he wrote. Knowing the Lithuanian language was important in being a Lithuanian, but so was having the right "feel" for and "innately" understanding one's nation's past; thus Daukantas justified his personalization of Lithuanian history on a purely individual basis.

Despite his prejudices, one can point out positive aspects in Daukantas's methods because of his knowledge of philology. In his *Character* he mentions the works of the Danish linguist Rask and the Germans Bohlen and Schleicher.³⁹ As incorrect as he was, he used a form of comparative linguistics in associating Lithuanian and German words and place-names.⁴⁰ In his *Character* he even had a vague notion of geology and paleontology. He mentioned dinosaur bones, the rising of mountains, and the receding of seas.⁴¹ *Character* is in fact the first social history of Lithuania. He used a thematic approach in *Character*, breaking down Lithuania's history into an analysis of Lithuania's geography, paganism, agriculture, war, commerce, and money. Unfortunately, Daukantas's conclusions about pagan Lithuania were based on nineteenth century observations. Because his footnoting is so inconsistent, one cannot know what Daukantas was a

witness too. For instance, the materials about forest and farm holidays are in themselves primary sources on nineteenth-century Lithuania. The problem is that Daukantas believed that these observations were accurate sources for Lithuania's prehistory.⁴² Yet, it is in the area of folklore that Daukantas shows his greatest strengths and weaknesses. Daukantas collected folk songs and folklore, which he often privately published. Simply because he knew the language and its nuances and because he had contact with the peasantry, Daukantas was more qualified in researching village life in Lithuania than those Lithuanian-Poles who had lost touch with the countryside.⁴³

Because Daukantas and his fellow romantics often contradicted themselves, doing justice to their views is problematical. In opposition to the rationalism of the Enlightenment, romanticism asserted that the nation and not the individual was the measure of all things. Under the influence of such romantic nationalists as Herder and Fichte, Daukantas also searched for Lithuania's *Volksgeist* in a unique medieval past, which for Narbutt and Daukantas was a repository of all things virtuous. To this day medieval Grand Dukes hold court over Lithuanian historiography. Another element of Lithuanian romanticism is the idealization of the past. Like Rousseau and Herder, Daukantas thought that the savage, untainted by the evils of civilization, was inherently noble. This idealization of the savage had its parallel among the Poles also. Even Lelewel in his *Pielgrzym w Dobromilu* [Pilgrimage to Dobromil] thought that prior to the introduction of Christianity the people of the Vistula were free. Herder thought that the Slavs had never been as warlike as the Germans. Likewise, Kraszewski and Narbutt thought that the stereotype of the Lithuanian barbarian had its origins with the Teutonic Knights and that the Lithuanians were gentle, generous, and friendly.⁴⁴ Of course, Daukantas felt that the idea of Lithuania's barbarism was further perpetuated by the Poles.

Like many romantic nationalists, Daukantas believed that the peasantry constituted the nation. It was they who preserved the language and traditions of their forefathers. Although the idea of Lithuania as a nation-state had not yet crystallized, Daukantas rejected the notion that the szlachta constituted the political nation. Furthermore, Daukantas did not see Lithuania merely as a state but rather as an ethnic nation.

Living in a time of revolution and reaction, Daukantas was something of a liberal and a democrat, rejecting the theory of divine right of kings. Like many of the professors at the University of Vilnius, he believed in inalienable rights. Echoing Rousseau, Daukantas asserted that man is born free and independent and that no one could take those rights away. He believed that the ruler and his subjects entered into a social contract:

It is known that until the most recent epoch, the world was free and without the consent of the people neither the Grand Duke nor the *Krivė* dared to act in state affairs, which is just, because whoever carries the burden should know why he is carrying the burden.⁴⁵

In many ways Daukantas was a typical nineteenth-century progressive intellectual who held views consistent with the three great nineteenth-century 'isms' of nationalism, liberalism, and romanticism. For him, Polish meant denationalization and oppression. Daukantas's analysis of prehistoric Lithuanian land ownership was in reality an indictment of serfdom which he calls slavery. He thought the source of a well-ordered society was property acquired through work.⁴⁶ Nonetheless, his attitudes on the social question always had an ethno-linguistic element. When writing about serfdom, Daukantas mixed class, language, and national differences. Although Daukantas did not participate in any political or insurrectionary movements, he based many of his conclusions about Lithuania's history on his own liberal democratic ideas. Daukantas maintained that, as the Lithuanian boyars became Polonized, the Poles subordinated the social and national questions to the interests of the *szlachta*. In other words, because the Polish *szlachta* used a different language, they were of a different class and therefore a different nation. In Daukantas's world view, language was the determining factor in dividing Poles and Lithuanians; any notion of conflict between the Poles and the Lithuanians based solely on class would have been foreign to him as it would have been foreign to most writers. In using the Lithuanian language he wrote for the literate peasantry, as he stated in his *Deeds*: "I do not write for scholars or thinkers but for the mothers who can tell their

children about the deeds of their fathers and forefathers, but without the written word they often make mistakes.”⁴⁷

Daukantas thought that in prehistoric Lithuania, the land was communal. The Samogitians did not know serfdom in pre-Union Lithuania.⁴⁸ Daukantas incorrectly believed that the Lithuanians elected a military leader during wars. He further thought that medieval Lithuanians and Samogitians convened a sejm to elect their rulers democratically. For Daukantas, the medieval Lithuanians were a free and democratic people whose liberty the Poles had taken away. He blamed the Poles for serfdom, for falsifying Lithuanian history and for belittling the Lithuanian language:

...in 1569 we fell on greater woes where we gave into Polish rule...some of us becoming spoiled, while others boasting of their boyar status and imitating Polish ways, waited for the Poles to bring them happiness, but the Poles having invaded Lithuania wanted to turn the Lithuanians into slaves.... Poles did not work for the betterment of the economy but only so they could eat well and not work...and soon Lithuania became just like Poland, where the population serves their masters.⁴⁹

Along with serfdom, the Poles brought economic decline and moral decay to the peasantry. By making the Poles into villains, Daukantas tied class, ethnic, and linguistic issues together. In this vein he wrote,

Whoever did not speak Polish was not a human being...and when the Poles invaded Lithuania they brought their customs from the Polish lands; they no longer allowed a Lithuanian ploughman to sell his land or take up a free trade as was our custom from the days of old. We became like a bull tied to one spot trampling his own manure just like they do in Poland...as the words duty and corvéé are Polish words not Lithuanian words.⁵⁰

Daukantas argued that Poland had a well-developed form of feudalism with serfdom as its cornerstone. Daukantas thought, “The Poles brought us oligarchy and the peasants class slavery; anyone who does not have proof should not dare repeat the empty stories of the XV- and XVI-century chroniclers.”⁵¹ Overall, he blamed Lithuania’s nineteenth century poverty on Polish rule.

Daukantas held an equivocal position on the relationship between Polonization and the Christianization of Lithuania. Pagan Lithuania for Daukantas was a harmonious and peaceful society, which Christianity had destroyed. Daukantas associated Polonization with the Church whose clergy no longer spoke Lithuanian and therefore contributed to the cultural denationalization of the Lithuanians. While never directly denouncing Catholicism, he blamed the Teutonic Knights and then later the Poles for bringing a foreign, slave-holding, intolerant, undemocratic and hypocritical religious institution into a pristine Lithuania. Polish historians often claimed that they brought civilization with Christianity to Lithuania. Daukantas did not fear cutting Lithuania off from Polish cultural achievements because he did not think they were that important. From his perspective Lithuania had contributed more to Poland than vice versa. In other words, Daukantas maintained that the Poles and Christianity only brought misery to Lithuania. This attack on Polish Christianity and his idealization of pagan Lithuania extended to his choice of sources. For example, because the medieval Polish chronicler Jan Długosz was unsympathetic to pagan Lithuania, Daukantas often used non-Polish sources like the Russian historian Karamazin or some German historians.

Having lost their independence, the Poles and the Lithuanians made history into a fountain of national identity and a source for all sorts of civic lessons. Daukantas was a part of the Polish intellectual milieu of the early nineteenth-century, but he always put a Lithuanian face on his writings. Even though Lithuanians usually do not want to admit a debt to Polish culture, some late nineteenth-century Lithuanian activists acknowledged that nothing had helped the Lithuanian rebirth quite like Polish Romanticism.⁵² In many ways Lithuanian historiography has not progressed far from its origins in Polish Romanticism. Daukantas was a product of, participated in, and rejected the Polish elements of Vilnius Romanticism. Because many of the Polish romantic authors like Kraszewski, Kondratowicz, Słowacki, and Mickiewicz started their careers in Vilnius, the Grand Duchy influenced Polish Romanticism as much as Poland influenced the Grand Duchy.

Just as many nineteenth-century western Romantics wrote about national origins and myths, so too Daukantas wrote about Lithuania's

beginnings. Because Daukantas and his contemporaries did not have the benefits of modern research, they made quite a few mistakes in their conclusions about Lithuanian ancestry. Nevertheless, Daukantas, Narbutt and the other romantics did not merely 'invent' Lithuania's beginnings. They usually based their conclusions on the works of earlier historians or chronicles.

National sentiment may have been a stronger motive in selecting and interpreting these earlier works than dispassionate scholarship, but Daukantas and his contemporaries went beyond their predecessors in scholarship. At that time the attitude prevailed that every pagan religion in its essence was identical to either Greek or Roman mythology—"interpretatio romana." Often early nineteenth-century historians would draw parallels between their own history and classical history, based on coincidental similarities. At least in this regard, Daukantas was methodologically superior to his medieval predecessors. For instance, Daukantas rejected Długosz's idea that the Lithuanian god of thunder "Perkūnas" was Jupiter. Yet, Daukantas believed that "the Lithuanian language and songs are similar in nature to the Greek and Roman languages and not the Polish language."⁵³ The Lithuanian language proves that the Lithuanians had "their own unique faith, government, elders, and nobility."⁵⁴ Similarly, the Lithuanian literary historian Dionizas Poška (1757-1830) considered the Lithuanian word for Christmas—*Kalėdos*—to be identical to the Roman "calendae" and so on.⁵⁵

Daukantas was more critical in his theory of the origins of Lithuania than Jan Długosz in his *Historiea Polonicae* or Strykowski's *Kronika*, both of which presented the theory of Lithuania's Roman origins as did the earlier chronicles of Henricus de Lettis (1290), Petrus de Dusburg (1351), and Wigand von Marburg (1394). Narbutt thought the Lithuanians were of Greek descent. As convoluted as Daukantas's explanations of Lithuania's origins were, Daukantas did not make the Lithuanians into Romans. They only seemingly had contacts with every ancient civilization and barbarian tribe. Relying on the more pro-Lithuanian historian Albert Wijuk-Kojałowicz (1609-1677), he believed that the Lithuanians were the descendants of the Herulians, who lived north of the Goths. During Odoacer's reign, they ruled Rome, but they then later moved to the Baltic where they found related tribes. Of course the Romans and the

Greeks knew these Herulian Lithuanians very well. Paradoxically, though peaceful, the Herulians conquered these territories, which included Slavic lands, thereby making them the legitimate rulers of these regions. As the legitimate rulers of the Baltic regions, these Herulian Lithuanians received tribute from the surrounding Slavs. Yet, they were benevolent and democratic rulers who did not hold slaves. "Only later, when the Poles usurped power, was oligarchy and slavery introduced into Lithuania."⁵⁶ While the Herulians are a historical Germanic tribe, Daukantas's interpretation of their connection with Lithuania is fantasy. Daukantas did not intentionally write nonsense, he simply used sources that happened to be inaccurate and favorable to his point of view.

By mythologizing the role of the Herulians, who influenced and in turn were affected by their contact with many ancient civilizations, Daukantas created the necessary mythical base for Lithuanian history. Daukantas mentioned the Geths (not to be confused with Goths), the Scythians, the Greeks, the Trojans, and the Romans as having had contacts with the Herulians. Along with the Lombards, Vandals, and Burgundians, the Herulians invaded and then partitioned Rome. After the death of their king Odoacer, they returned to the Baltic. This campaign in Italy enriched the Lithuanian language with Latin words and their religion with Roman mythology.⁵⁷ According to Daukantas's interpretation of Tacitus, the Samogitians taught the Slavs how to cultivate the land.⁵⁸ They hated serfdom, and of course these early Lithuanians had beautiful eyes, immaculate faces, and overall were the most handsome, virtuous, honest, and hardworking of all people.

For all of Daukantas's convoluted theories, he was only a little bit worse than most of his contemporaries. Rejecting the role of legend in history, Lelewel believed Palemon was mythical, and although he was skeptical of the connection between the Herulians and the Lithuanians, he did not repudiate this theory. But, Daukantas's favorite mentor, Onacewicz, in part accepted Strykowski's theory that the Lithuanians and the Slavs were the descendants of the Herulians.

There is however no confusion as to Daukantas's national sympathies regarding an interpretation of Lithuania's history. Again, Daukantas was not the first to reinterpret Lithuania's history, but reinterpreting the defining moments in Lithuanian history set

Daukantas's and Narbutt's histories apart from the previously written histories of Strykowski, Kojalowicz, or Jaroszewicz. Daukantas and Narbutt made interpreting Lithuanian history almost a game whereby whatever the Poles wrote about Lithuanian history, Daukantas and Narbutt wrote the opposite.

Because Daukantas regarded Poland as a foreign country, he consciously separated the histories of Poland and Lithuania. As was the prevailing habit among Polonized Lithuanians,⁵⁹ Daukantas ended his histories with the Union of Lublin.⁶⁰ Near the end of his *Samogitian History*, however, he promised to continue Lithuania's history in a third volume, which he never wrote. In his *Samogitian History* he wrote about the "realities" of the Union, such as the Union of Lublin would not have taken place had it not been for the death of Radvila [Pol.: Radziwiłł] the Black. And most importantly that,

...while the Union decreed that the two nations would protect each other, the Poles at every turn used the pretext of the Union as an excuse to reduce the size of Lithuania and enlarge the size of Poland. So started the demise of the famous Lithuanian nation, which was not caused by the bravery and tenacity of its enemies but by immorality and trickery...from that time everything Lithuanian, its language, its character, its traditions were disparaged and laughed at, while everything Polish was praised and honored...and while the Lithuanians agreed to obey the Polish king within the Union, they retained privileges in war and economics,...and overall they maintained their old ways of rule.⁶¹

In general Daukantas considered the reign of Sigismund Augustus a disaster for Lithuania. Narbutt also seems to have been on the road to crossing over the 1569 barrier of Lithuanian historiography. In a letter to Narbutt Daukantas praised Narbutt:

At least one person dared to cross Lithuania's historical barrier of 1569 drawn by the crownors; after all we had after that year our own judiciary, our own army, our own seals, and our own leaders equal to the crownors, but no one has had the daring to go down this road in exposing the crownors.⁶²

For all of their plans and mutual admiration, neither Daukantas nor Narbutt went beyond the Union of Lublin in their writings. Only in

their letters did they make grandiose plans for the writing of a continuous history of Lithuania.

Today Lithuanian historians seem reluctant to make their national rebirth into a reaction to Polonization or any kind of an oppositional movement. Yet, this is one of the prominent features of the movement. It was also a method of defining who a Lithuanian was not. A Lithuanian was not a Pole. As far as Daukantas was concerned Lithuania had an independent past whose culture surpassed Poland's.

In the early nineteenth century, no sharp line divided a Lithuanian or Polish national consciousness. Daukantas may have been the first to divide the linguistic Lithuanians, whom he regarded as native Lithuanians, from those Lithuanians who spoke only Polish. Although the linguistic Poles considered themselves part of Lithuania and different from the Poles of Poland, the linguistic Lithuanian intelligentsia, of whom Daukantas was one of the first representatives, slowly started to break away from the Poles and began to assert themselves culturally. Daukantas belonged to that group of Samogitian-Lithuanian intelligentsia already mentioned who paved the way for the late nineteenth-century national rebirth.

The Polish-Lithuanians did not see a relationship between themselves and the emerging ethno-linguistic Lithuanians. The Polish-Lithuanians perceived Lithuania in historical-territorial terms, whereas Daukantas viewed Lithuania in historical-linguistic terms. The Lithuanians like Daukantas, while never fully rejecting a territorial version of Lithuania's past, saw in medieval Lithuania a democratic peasant nation as opposed to a szlachta nation that writers like Kraszewski or Mickiewicz portrayed. In a time period before nationalism and mass movements, Daukantas had no nationalist program and no idea what Lithuania's future would be, but he was a proto-nationalist. It is difficult to say why he did not participate in the "Polish" insurrections of the early nineteenth century, but here again he may have been the first to realize that the insurrections were Polish affairs that would not benefit the Lithuanian peasants. By writing in the Lithuanian language for Lithuanians, Daukantas consciously wrote a nationalist history, a history for Lithuanians with anti-Polish biases. Although Daukantas's scholarship was poor, he was not different from many of his contemporaries. For all of his biases, Daukantas did not create his histories *ex nihilo*. He had the benefits of Polish

mentors, Polish sources, Polish cultural accomplishments, and he was a product of the historical Romanticism of nineteenth-century Europe.

Lithuanian scholars today evaluate Daukantas's works based on their literary value rather than their historical content. Yet, his impact on the future Lithuanian national rebirth and Lithuanian historiography is undeniable. Józef Chlebowczyk characterized the role of individuals like Daukantas:

In the nation-forming processes, especially at their very beginning and in the initial stage, a very significant role in respect of long-term social response is played by a specific type of ideologue or ideologue-cum activist, a visionary and dreamer who appeals not so much to the minds as to the hearts and emotions of his fellow-countrymen....⁶³

Daukantas was the prophet who heralded the Lithuanian national rebirth and set the tone for the future development of Lithuanian historiography. To this day the nationalist anti-Polish tone that Daukantas articulated remains a prominent feature in Lithuanian historiography. After the closing of the University of Vilnius in 1832, Lithuanians produced no professionally trained historians till 1904. In this historiographic vacuum, the activists of the Lithuanian national rebirth used the works of Daukantas both as a historical source as well as a foundation for a nationalist ideology. Even though Daukantas was not a Grand Duke, the late-nineteenth-century Lithuanian activists included Daukantas in their pantheon of national heroes.

NOTES

1. Lithuanian historians have written a great deal about Daukantas. The two most recent biographies are: Saulius Žukas, *Simonas Daukantas: Gyvenimas ir Kuryba* [Simonas Daukantas: His Life and Works] (Kaunas: Šviesa, 1988); and Vytautas Merkys, *Simonas Daukantas* (Vilnius: Vyturys, 1991). For a summary of his life in English see Simas Sužiedelis, ed., *Encyclopedia Lituanica* (Boston: Kapočius, 1972), s.v. "Daukantas," by Simas Sužiedelis.

2. Daukantas often used the terms Lithuania and Samogitia as if they were separate ethnographic regions. For some reason Daukantas purposely used archaic Samogitian words and expressions that even his contemporaries did not understand.

3. Vincent Trumpa, "Simonas Daukantas, Historian and Pioneer of Lithuanian National Rebirth," *Lituanus*, 11, no. 1 (1965): 5-17.

4. Egidijus Aleksandravičius, "Socialinės ir Psichologinės Lietuvos Romantinės Istorigrafijos Pielaidos" [Social and Psychological Factors in Lithuanian Romanticized Historiography], *Sietynas*, 9 (Vilnius: 1990): 141.

5. Motiejus Miškinis, *Lietuvių Literatūra* (Kaunas: Šviesa, 1990), 195.

6. Marcin Poczubutt quoted in Stasys Yla, "The Clash of Nationalities at the University of Vilnius, 1803-1832," *Lituanus*, 27 no. 2 (1981): 77.

7. Žukas, *Simonas Daukantas: Gyvenimas ir Kuryba*, 32.

8. Adolfas Šapoka, *Vilnius Lietuvos gyvenime* [Vilnius in the Life of Lithuania] (Toronto: Author, 1954), 16.

9. Very few Lithuanians in the modern ethnic and linguistic sense attended the university because by definition a student had to be of noble birth, which made the Lithuanian peasants ineligible for matriculation.

10. Maciūnas, *Lituanistinis Sąjūdis*, 176.

11. Joachim Lelewel, *Jakim ma być hystoryk* (Vilnius: Marcinowski, 1815), 374.

12. From the Polish word *Koroniaz*—a resident of the Kingdom of Poland.

13. Simonas Daukantas, "Letter to Teodor Narbutt, 29 June 1843, St. Petersburg," in *Raštai* [Writings], vol. 2, (Vilnius: Vaga, 1976), 743.

14. Algirdas Šidlauskas, "Joachimas Lelevelis apie Istorijos Objektą savo Paskaitose" [Joachim Lelewel about the Object of History in his Lectures], *Istorija*, 13 (Vilnius: Mintis, 1972): 51.

15. Joachim Lelewel, *Historyka* (Warsaw: Dąbrowski, 1862), 7-8.

16. "... unosić się miłością ojczyzny i narodowości," *Ibid.*, 327.

17. Algirdas Šidlauskas, *Istorija Vilniaus Universitete XIXa. pirmojoje pusėje* [History at the University of Vilnius in the First Half of the 19th Century] (Vilnius: Mokslas, 1986), 71.

18. Simas Sužiedėlis and Juozas Jakštas, eds., *Encyclopedia Lituanica* (Boston: Juozas Kapočius, 1975), s.v. "Onaciewicz, Ignacy," by Juozas Jakštas.

19. Józef Kraszewski, *Wilno od początków jego do roku 1750* [Vilnius from its beginnings to 1750], 3 vols. (Vilnius: Zawadski, 1840), 107.

20. Teodor Narbutt, *Dzieje narodu litewskiego*, vol. 9, (Vilnius: Macinowski, 1835), 492.

21. Daukantas, "Letter to Narbutt, 19 September 1843, St. Petersburg," *Raštai*, vol. 2, 753.

22. *Ibid.*

23. *Ibid.*

24. It must be mentioned that while modern Lithuanian historians generally agree that Daukantas was overly anti-Polish in his writing, there still exists a hatred of Poles that even scholarship cannot overcome. Arguably the most respected twentieth-century Lithuanian historian, Zenonas Ivinskis, wrote: "Daukantas's attitude toward the Poles today seems naive; those, however, who know Polish historiography...understand him...these attitudes have been justified in the light of recent history." Ivinskis was here referring to the Vilnius question. See Zenonas Ivinskis, "Lietuvos istorija romantizmo metu ir dabar," *Lietuvių Katalikų Mokslo Akademija*, 3, 326.

25. Daukantas, "Letter to Narbutt, 29 June 1843, St. Petersburg," in *Raštai*, vol. 2, 734.

26. Daukantas, "Letter to Narbutt, 3 March 1845, St. Petersburg," in *Ibid.*, 763.

27. Daukantas, "Letter to Narbut, 4 May 1842, St. Petersburg," in *Ibid.*, 720.
28. Daukantas, "Letter to Narbut, 22 June 1845, St. Petersburg," in *Ibid.*, 760.
29. Zenonas Ivinskis, "Simonas Daukantas ir jo palikimas Lietuvos Istorijos srityje," [Simonas Daukantas and His Legacy in the Area of Lithuanian History] *Aidai*, 9 (Brooklyn: November 1964): 385-395.
30. Daukantas, "Letter to Narbut, 29 June 1843, St. Petersburg," in *Raštai*, 735.
31. Vytautas Berenis, "Simono Daukanto ir Juozo Jaroševičiaus Istorinės Lietuvos Samprata" [Simonas Daukantas's and Józef Jaroszewicz's Understanding of Historical Lithuania], Egidijus Motieka et al., eds., *Simonas Daukantas*, vol. 5, *Lietuvių Atgimimo Istorijos Studijos*, 103.
32. Daukantas, *Darbai Senujų Lietuvių ir Žemaičių* [The Deeds of the Old Lithuanians and Samogitians], in *Raštai*, vol. 1, 212.
33. Narbut, *Dzieje*, vol. 4, 30.
34. Vytautas Merkys, *Simonas Daukantas* (Vilnius: Vyturys, 1991), 84.
35. Augustinas Janulaitis, "Simanas Daukantas," *Lietuvių Tauta*, 2, no. 2 (Vilnius: Kuktos, 1913): 269.
36. Daukantas, *Pasakojimas apie veikalus Lietuvių tautos senovėje* [A Tale about the Deeds of the Old Lithuanian Nation], in *Raštai*, vol. 2, 39.
37. *Ibid.*, 36.
38. Egidijus Aleksandravičius, *XIX amžiaus profiliai* [19th Century Profiles] (Vilnius: Lietuvos Rašytojų Sąjungos leidykla, 1993), 37.
39. Vytautas Merkys, "Nacionalinio Išsivadavimo Judėjimas ir Kitų Tautų Pažangioji Visuomenė" [National Liberation Movements and the Progressive Elements in Other Nations], in *Lietuvių Nacionalinio Išsivadavimo: ligi 1904 metu*, Vytautas Merkys et al., eds. (Vilnius: Mokslas, 1987), 221.
40. Daukantas, *Būdas senovės lietuvių kalnėnų ir žemaičių* [The Character of the Olden Lithuanians, Highlanders and Lowlanders], in *Raštai*, vol. 1, 418.
41. *Ibid.*, 404.
42. K. Grigas, "Simonas Daukantas – Lietuvių Tautosakos Rinkėjas, Leidėjas ir Vertintojas" [Simonas Daukantas – Lithuanian Folklore Gatherer, Publisher and Evaluator], Žiugžda, Juozas et al., *Iš Lietuvių Kultūros Istorijos* [From Lithuania's Cultural History] (Vilnius: Valstybinės Politinės ir Mokslinės Literatūros Leidykla, 1958), 285.
43. *Ibid.*, 271.
44. Narbut, *Dzieje*, vol. 9, 252.
45. Daukantas, *Būdas*, 578.
46. *Ibid.*, 572.
47. Daukantas, *Darbai*, 40.
48. *Ibid.*, 98.
49. Daukantas, *Būdas*, 640.
50. *Ibid.*, 645.
51. Daukantas, "Letter to Narbut, 24 February 1845, St. Petersburg," in *Raštai*, 755.
52. Vytautas Kubilius, *Lietuvių Literatūra ir Pasaulinės Literatūros Procesas* [Lithuanian Literature and the Process of World Literature] (Vilnius: Vaga, 1983), 245.
53. Daukantas, "Dainės Žemaičių" [Samogitian Songs], in *Raštai*, vol. 1, 660.
54. Daukantas, *Būdas*, 408.
55. Maciūnas, *Lituanistinis Sąjūdis*, 227.

56. Daukantas, "Letter to Narbutt, 12 February 1845, St. Petersburg," in *Raštai*, 755-756.

57. Algirdas Šidlauskas, "Istorija," *Vilniaus Universiteto Istorija 1803-1940*, Vytautas Merkys et al., eds., (Vilnius: Mokslas, 1977), 79.

58. Daukantas, *Istorija Žemaitiška*, vol. 1, 68.

59. Some historians like Józef Jaroszewicz (1793-1860) in his *Obraz Litwy pod względem jęj oświaty i cywilizacyi, od czasów najdawniejszych do końca wieku XVIII* [A Picture of Lithuania According to Its Enlightenment and Civilization, from the Oldest Times to the End of the XVIII Century] continued Lithuania's history to the end of the eighteenth century. As sympathetic as Jaroszewicz was to Lithuania's history, he interpreted the Union of Lublin favorably. He regarded Lithuanian civilization as distinct but not separate from Poland. It must be added that Jaroszewicz's histories still have value for the modern researcher. He was as scientific a historian as was possible in the early nineteenth century. See Józef Jaroszewicz, *Obraz Litwy*, vols. 1-3 (Vilnius: Rafałowicz, 1844-1845).

60. It is worth noting that Polish historians often picked up Lithuania's history in 1387 with the Union of Krewo and then included Lithuania's history into a larger history of Poland.

61. Daukantas, *Istorija Žemaitiška*, vol. 1, 408.

62. Daukantas, "Letter to Narbutt, 29 June 1843, St. Petersburg," in *Raštai*, 743.

63. Chlebowczyk, *On Small and Young Nations in Europe*, 119.

VI

TWO SCIENTIFIC HISTORIANS

There is no knowledge of man other than that which is rooted in empirical historical observation.

WILHELM DILTHEY

STANEVIČIUS

Nineteenth century Lithuanian historiography did not produce a scientific school of history. Yet, the Samogitian national rebirth produced two historians who were more critical in their approach to analyzing documents than their contemporaries. Simonas Stanevičius (Pol.: Szymon Staniewicz, 1799-1848) and Bishop Motiejus Valančius (Pol.: Maciej Wołonczewski, 1801-1975) will be contrasted with the Romantic nationalists.

Coming from a petty szlachta family, Simonas Stanevičius attended the University of Vilnius, where he participated in the intellectual life of the 1820's, and was a contemporary of Narbutt, Mickiewicz, and Daukantas and a product of such professors as Lelewel, Onacewicz, and Daniłowicz. In Vilnius Stanevičius became acquainted with the ideas of Herder, and following Herder's example, he collected folk songs and folklore. He graduated in 1826 with a candidate's degree in literature and the liberal arts. From 1829 he lived on Graf Jerzy Plater's estate and managed the estate's library. Plater (1810-1836) was himself a leader in the Samogitian movement, doing extensive research in bibliographic studies and Lithuanian literature.¹

As pessimistic as Narbutt and Mickiewicz were about the future of Lithuania and its language, Stanevičius echoed the optimism of his fellow "learned Samogitians." In the introduction to a grammar written on one page in Lithuanian and Latin on the other page, Stanevičius wrote, "at a time when a majority of the Samogitians—some out of love for their fatherland, others because they want to know everything—they write and read Lithuanian."² In

his poem "Szłowy Żemaycziu" [The Samogitian's Glory], Stanevičius wrote, "in disaster Lithuania's descendants remain healthy."³ To appreciate Stanevičius's viewpoint one must contrast these words with Mickiewicz's from *Konrad Wallenrod*: "Lithuania now exists only in the past."

Stanevičius's significance as a historian rests on one unfinished manuscript written after 1831 but only partially published in 1893. *Wyjaśnienie Mythologii Litewskiej, Zawartej w Dziełach Hartknocha, Strykowskiego, Lasickiego, Tudzież w Słownikach Litewskich Szyrwida, Ruhiga i Mielckiego Przez Szymona Staniewicz Kolleg Sekretarza* [An Explanation of Lithuanian Mythology Written in the Works of Hartknoch, Strykowski, Lasicki, and in Lithuanian Dictionaries of Szyrwid, Ruigys and Mielcke] is the first critical Lithuanian history. Unfortunately for Lithuanian historiography, Stanevičius was not a historian, but rather a philologist who used internal textual analysis and historical logic to prove his predecessors wrong.

According to the Polish historian Michał Baliński, Stanevičius was the foremost authority on Samogitian and Lithuanian folklore.⁴ More than any Lithuanian, Stanevičius had a critical approach to Lithuanian mythology. He wrote that, "Lithuanian mythology still remains chaotic. Along-side real things there are made-up things; next to real Lithuanian words there are barbarisms and nonexistent oddities. This is because non-Lithuanians have dominated the study of Lithuanian mythology."⁵ Again much like Poška, Stanevičius did not have Daukantas's anti-Polish prejudices, but he believed that outsiders distorted Lithuanian mythology, sometimes out of ignorance, sometimes out of spite.⁶

At that time historians like Teodor Narbutt used folklore and folk songs as a source in researching the origins of ancient Lithuania. Narbutt believed that nineteenth century peasants sang some of the same songs that the prehistoric Lithuanians did. But in the introduction to his collection of Samogitian songs, Stanevičius refuted the claim that the peasantry still sang the songs of the ancient priests. Stanevičius believed it was worthless to do ethnographic research searching for ancient songs among the peasantry.⁷ He thought that songs reflected either the supernatural or an idealized version of the peasants' life, but he did not think that they depicted the past. He also criticized Teodor Narbutt's concept of Lithuanian mythology by

denying any connection between Lithuanian mythology and Roman myths. He accused Narbutt of using neither chronicles nor folklore.⁸ His approach to Lithuanian mythology was primarily linguistic, whereby he systematically took Narbutt's fantasized Lithuanian-Roman gods and showed either their Lithuanian etymology or their lack of connection with Latin. Although hardly a revisionist in the modern sense, in view of the naiveté of authors like Narbutt and Daukantas, Stanevičius's critical approach was remarkably scholarly for his time and place. He cited his sources carefully, did not use his imagination to fill in the gaps, and when possible compared different versions of the same document. Nor did he merely deconstruct pre-history: he often traced the source of the chroniclers' errors and then speculated about alternative avenues of research.

As limited as his research, output, and influence on Lithuanian history was, Stanevičius founded a critical school of historiography. In contrast, Poška and Daukantas only wanted a heroic, idealized version of Lithuania's history. They flattered Narbutt because Narbutt's fanciful Lithuanian history satisfied their criteria for a patriotic history. In two extant letters sent to Teodor Narbutt, it seems Stanevičius had cordial relations with Narbutt, but on a scholarly level in his *Lithuanian Mythology*, Stanevičius systematically dissected Narbutt's nine volume *History of the Lithuanian Nation*, eventually calling it the Lithuanian equivalent of "A Thousand and One Nights."⁹ In the second letter to Narbutt, Stanevičius dismissed the manuscript of his fellow Samogitian and University of Vilnius graduate Daukantas's *Deeds* by writing that, "it will not give us anything new because the author is more of an orator than a thorough researcher of history and geography."¹⁰

Stanevičius did not challenge the story of Palemon, and he did not fully reject Lithuania's Roman origins. He relied on Strykowski and Lasicki, but he pointed out Strykowski's flaws and inconsistencies. Many of the Samogitian cultural leaders like Poška knew only a few sources. Some could only read Polish and Latin, and so they perpetuated the mistakes of the chroniclers especially Strykowski. Stanevičius realized that some of Strykowski's errors originated with inaccurate information in the earlier chronicles of Peter Dusburg.¹¹ Although he valued Strykowski, he systematically destroyed every

connection that Strykowski made between Lithuanian gods and Roman gods. Nevertheless he held on to the mistaken notion that the Lithuanian language was related more to the Greek and Latin languages than to the Slavic languages. He made interminable lists of Lithuanian, Latin, and Polish words, and lists of place-names and grammar rules to make his point. Even though he made mistakes, he was less likely to distort the past just to idealize Lithuania's history.

One often needs to look no further than the titles of Stanevičius's chapters to see his critical approach to his subject. For instance, "Pseudo-church, that is the false church of Perkūnas in Kaunas" disproves the accuracy of the name Perkūnas [the god of thunder], which could not possibly be used for the name of a Catholic church. Stanevičius also shattered the dearly-held legend about the eternally green sacred oak tree at Romuva in front of which burned an eternal flame watched over by priests and vestals. The reality is that pre-historic Lithuania never had a priestly class nor sacred oaks. More than attacking medieval and Renaissance chroniclers, Stanevičius scorned Teodor Narbutt's uncritical use of Strykowski. Narbutt valued chronicles, mythology archeology, and legends equally. Having been Lelewel's student, Stanevičius carefully judged the validity of his sources. Because Strykowski actually saw Lithuanian pagan rituals, Stanevičius considered him the most reliable source on mythology, but in other instances Stanevičius was very skeptical of Strykowski's information.

Because Stanevičius's *Lithuanian Mythology* remained essentially unpublished until 1967, its impact on Lithuanian historiography was limited. Nevertheless, the same can be said about Daukantas's works. In addition, Stanevičius's critical approach to history might not have had a positive reception in a population that held on to old beliefs flavored with heroics. Yet, for all of his skepticism about Lithuanian history, Stanevičius was never in doubt about his own identity. Aleksandras Fromas, a writer with whom Stanevičius lived the last years of his life, wrote that, "the lord boyars and other Poles considered Stanevičius crazy because he spread Lithuanianism and he read books throughout the night."¹²

BISHOP VALANČIUS

Bishop Motiejus Valančius (Pol.: Maciej Wołonczewski, 1801-1875) was the central figure of the nineteenth-century Lithuanian national rebirth. He founded a temperance movement, resisted Russification, organized underground elementary schools, called for the smuggling of Lithuanian books written in the Latin alphabet¹³ from Prussia into the Russian empire, and officially denounced the peasantry's participation in the 1863 Insurrection. If Valančius had not been a bishop with all that those duties entailed, given his voluminous religious writings, sermons, and official proclamations, Lithuanians would remember him as "the father of Lithuanian literary prose."¹⁴ Because of the breadth of his activities, many Lithuanians have seen him as a patriot who laid the foundations for Lithuanian independence.¹⁵

Even Soviet Lithuanian critics, who usually disapproved of clergymen, labeling them reactionary, assessed Valančius's writing favorably:

Valančius's literary writings, though they have quite a few reactionary elements, in general are a positive phenomenon in the development of Lithuanian literature. He created the best didactic prose examples in Lithuanian literature and in essence gave a start to Lithuanian literary prose.... Valančius was on the road to realism. Later, some of the best Lithuanian writers would go down that same road.¹⁶

Because he had to juggle Russian pressures and his loyalty to the church, historians have often perceived him as politically ambiguous. Valančius had to humor the szlachta while mollifying the peasantry. His diplomatic efforts in protecting the church from the Russians were in fact the first written and practical models of Lithuanian political science. Not only did Valančius believe Lithuanian violent resistance to Russian rule was impractical, he thought Polish attempts at insurrection were equally futile. In many ways Valančius was a realist and the first practitioner of organic work in Lithuania.¹⁷

In addition to his political, religious and literary activities, Valančius wrote *Žemajtiu Wiskupistę* [The Samogitian Diocese], published in 1848, the first critically sound history on a Lithuanian

subject in Lithuanian. Lithuanian, Polish and western scholars have labeled Valančius a product of the Enlightenment, contrasting his writings to those of the romantic Daukantas. More than his romantic contemporaries, Valančius relied on common sense in analyzing his sources.¹⁸ In effect historians claim that Valančius was a better, more critical, more objective, and more rational historian than Daukantas and most of the participants in the Lithuanistics movement.

Before analyzing Valančius the historian, the reader needs to know who he was. He was the first bishop of Samogitia (1850-1875) to come from a peasant family. Lithuanians, Poles, and Russians knew Valančius and his writings, unlike those of the previously mentioned historians. He dealt with tsars, popes, and the infamous hangman of Vilnius, Mikhail N. Murav'ev.¹⁹ He lived through two insurrections, the freeing of the serfs, the death of the old notion of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and the birth of a Lithuanian national movement, to which he made no small contribution.²⁰ Alexander II thought Valančius was insincere in his loyalty to the tsar, but he appreciated his cooperation during the 1863 Insurrection.²¹ In spite of Valančius's opposition to the insurrections, the Russians did not trust him. The vice-governor Lvov said, "if Valančius wanted to, after several months he could organize a more dangerous uprising."²² By 1884 the Vilnius governor general received a report from the education guardian N. Sergeevskii stating that,

In 1865 the Samogitians and Lithuanians spoke in their homes their forefathers' language and recognized only the Polish alphabet...the Russian tongue was virtually unheard in the Russian-Lithuanian and Samogitian homesteads.... Soon after Graf Murav'ev's changes, there began to spread the contraband smuggling of Latin alphabet books written in the Lithuanian and Samogitian dialects.... Bishop Valančius organized the smuggling, and the priests whom Valančius led were especially active in smuggling.²³

Though he preached non-violence, the Russians feared that as a leader of the peasantry Valančius might have a potential for violence.

Before dealing with Valančius's national consciousness, one must make several generalizations about the emergence of an independent Lithuanian national consciousness. Politically, there was no

Lithuanian-Polish conflict in the early nineteenth century. As was stated earlier, Lithuanian separatism was feudal in nature. The political conflict was between the Poles and the Russians over the issue of Polish independence. In this political struggle the Lithuanian peasants were an auxiliary force to the Polish *szlachta*. Although Russification had not made Lithuanians Russians or Orthodox, the tsar and Murav'ev's policies destroyed the leadership of the Polonized Lithuanian *szlachta*. After the abolition of serfdom, literacy began to spread, in part due to Valančius's efforts. Because of Valančius's work in organizing underground schools, the leadership of the forthcoming Lithuanian national rebirth came from the peasantry. A Lithuanian of peasant origin himself, Valančius did not yet exhibit the virulent anti-Polonism that Daukantas had or his successors would.

The logic of siding with the Poles in a struggle against the Russians was no longer apparent. Because of the two failed insurrections and the growth of nationalism, the Lithuanian intelligentsia began to see themselves in a leadership role. Although no one dreamed of an independent Lithuania, the Lithuanian intelligentsia had to make a choice of whether to side with the Russians or the Poles. Religion dictated that the Lithuanians side with the Poles against the Russians, but socially and culturally the Russians did not represent as much of a threat to the Lithuanians as the Poles did. Valančius felt that the Polish alternative to Russification was Polonization, which would do nothing for the Lithuanian peasant. Instead of seeing his world divided between the Russians and the Poles, Valančius believed that a third element had to be nurtured. Lithuanians had to create their own culture. Furthermore, for the development of a distinct Lithuanian national consciousness, the ethnic, cultural, and linguistic conflict would have to be between Lithuanians and Poles. A political break from the Russians would have to wait. Valančius's national identity is not in question. He was born in Lithuania, wrote in Lithuanian, and involved himself in Lithuanian affairs. But he also wrote in Polish. And Valančius had to deal with a Polonized Catholic clergy, who had assumed an important role in the Polish-Russian conflict. Was his opposition to Russification a by-product of his Lithuanianness or his Catholicism? Moreover could an independent Lithuanian Catholic clergy replace the older Polonized priests?

The intellectual milieu of Vilnius that had formed Daukantas only partially shaped Valančius. He graduated from the Supreme Seminary at Vilnius in 1828, and in the same year he was ordained a priest. In 1842 he earned a doctorate from the Vilnius Theological Academy. Presumably, Thomas Aquinas influenced Valančius more than Lelewel did. That same year the Academy's faculty and teaching staff, on orders of the tsar, moved to St. Petersburg where Valančius found a group of Lithuanians. They included Daukantas, who had been working there for several years. Daukantas surrounded himself with a small group of Lithuanians who were interested in preserving the Lithuanian language. It is uncertain whether Valančius joined Daukantas's circle.²⁴ In a letter to the tsar's religious overseer in Lithuania, Jonas Gintila (Pol.: Jan Gintylło, 1788-1857), Valančius wrote, "I have established ties with Mr. Simonas [Daukantas] 'juncits viribus' and maybe we will prepare something in Samogitian literature."²⁵ Later when Valančius and Daukantas returned to Samogitia, their relationship became strained.

In 1850 when Valančius became the bishop of Samogitia, his diocesan seat was in Varniai. Probably because of financial difficulties, Daukantas intermittently resided in Varniai as Valančius's house guest. Being older and without influence, Daukantas hoped Valančius would help him get his books published, but in the end Valančius helped Daukantas sell only some of his works. Daukantas in turn must have helped Valančius in the writing of his *Samogitian Diocese*. Daukantas provided his own copied version of the "Lithuanian Metrics"²⁶ to Valančius for use in the *Samogitian Diocese*. Without Daukantas, Valančius would not have had some important primary sources. In addition, Valančius cited Daukantas's *Samogitian History* four times in his *Samogitian Diocese*. An unanswered question is whether Daukantas influenced Valančius to write his *Samogitian Diocese* in the Lithuanian language rather than Polish.

The stereotypical Samogitian is supposed to be stubborn. Daukantas and Valančius lived up to that stereotype and consequently quarreled. In a letter to his publisher, Valančius complained about Daukantas: "Mr. Daukantas, being an old man and a literatus, has become very strange; several times I have had to control his private habits."²⁷ Valančius's pastoral and organizational work increasingly

took precedence over his literary interests, while Daukantas was more interested in his 'own histories. In commenting on Daukantas's *Samogitian History*, Valančius supposedly asked, "did you write it when you were drunk?"²⁸ While the quote remains unsubstantiated, it accurately reflects Valančius's low opinion of Daukantas as a historian.

If language usage is an indicator of national identity, one must note that all of Valančius's correspondence and conversations with his fellow "learned Samogitians" were in Polish. A philologist, Andrzej Ugenski (1816-1870) wrote letters to the bishop in Lithuanian, and repeatedly Valančius responded in Polish. Once when one of his priests wrote Valančius a letter in Lithuanian, the bishop responded in Russian.²⁹ Quite logically, in his pastoral letters to the peasantry Valančius used the Lithuanian language. Although he spoke Polish with the clergy, he demanded that they speak Lithuanian to the peasantry in order to discharge their duties better.³⁰

Western and Lithuanian historians have credited Valančius with starting a system of illegal Lithuanian schools, which raised Lithuanian national consciousness and made Lithuania one of the most literate provinces in the Russian empire.³¹ Indeed, the Valančius schools taught the peasants how to read Lithuanian, but some of the schools taught Lithuanian only as an auxiliary language. Polish was also one of the languages of instruction. There is no doubt that Valančius resisted Russification. Murav'ev repeatedly fined him for resisting Russian efforts to convert Lithuanians to Orthodoxy, but this resistance to Russian rule was nonviolent and did not have a strong Lithuanian national component.

To appreciate Valančius's attitude toward nationality one must compare him to another Lithuanian bishop of the nineteenth century, Antanas Baranauskas (Pol.: Antoni Baranowski, 1831-1902), the bishop of Sejny. Baranauskas wrote some of the most beautiful Lithuanian poetry in Lithuanian literature. Equally tenacious as Valančius in opposing Russification, Baranauskas proclaimed his loyalty to the Polish-Lithuanian union. He denounced the Lithuanian national activists as a group of renegade Polish separatists playing into the hands of the Russians. Valančius forgave Baranauskas this act of "treason against Lithuanianness" because Baranauskas had contrib-

uted so much to Lithuanian literature.³² But because of Valančius's political realism, his participation in the secular aspects of the Lithuanian national rebirth always remained indirect. Valančius believed that the Lithuanian peasantry should be ministered to in their own language, but the national concerns of the minuscule Lithuanian intelligentsia seemed quixotic.

In contrast to his pastoral, political, and educational work, Valančius's literary output was almost completely in Lithuanian. Valančius's most popular and widely read works were repetitive moralizing tales intended to instruct the peasantry, a form common in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Europe. *Palangos Juzė* is his most famous story: it teaches morality, geography, and all sorts of practical little lessons. Besides these stories, he also wrote some religious works in Lithuanian. Excluding his *Life of Christ*, *The Life of the Virgin Mary*, and numerous similar religious histories, Valančius's importance as a historian rests primarily with his *Samogitian Diocese*.

To this day no Lithuanian diocese has such an extensive history as Samogitia. Of greater significance, Valančius wrote the *Samogitian Diocese* in Lithuanian. This was such an unexpected event that when Kajetan Niezabitowski (1800-1876) heard about its publication and the publication of Daukantas's *Deeds*, Niezabitowski asked the two authors for the original Polish versions of these two books so that he could publish them in Warsaw. To his astonishment, Niezabitowski found out that Valančius and Daukantas could take notes and write the originals in Lithuanian. Neither book was a translation from Polish.³³ In the *Encyklopedyja powszechna* of 1866, the Polish historian Julian Bartoszewicz wrote an article about bishop "Wołonczewski" and the *Samogitian Diocese*:

The people's priest had drawn himself to the peasantry and had learned their language. There is some type of unfriendliness here toward the szlachta, the most enlightened class of the nation. The author did immeasurable damage in writing this work in Lithuanian. Obviously, the peasantry needs prayer literature in their own language, but it is not understood why the peasantry needs other types of literature. This work is scholarly...if only the author had written it in both Polish and Lithuanian, then if they in fact read such books, he could have satisfied the Samogitians' curiosity.³⁴

Just the act of writing something scholarly in Lithuanian elicited a sharp reaction. In a letter to Daukantas, Valančius wrote, "You are not the only one who gets criticism for not writing in Polish."³⁵ Although many Lithuanians have written in the Polish language, the only Lithuanian history translated into Polish during the nineteenth century was Valančius's *Samogitian Diocese*.³⁶ Evidently, the Poles held it in high regard.

Valančius intended his *Samogitian Diocese* as a secular history rather than an inspirational work. He did not include supernatural events in his book; on the contrary, he exposed religious superstitions. Valančius argued that many of the peasantry's most beloved shrines, springs, and chapel icons had no healing powers. He criticized the clergy for exploiting the ignorance of the peasantry and denounced witch-burnings and all manner of superstition. Nor does one find simple-minded anti-Protestant rhetoric in the *Samogitian Diocese*. He blamed many of the successes of the Reformation on the corruption of the Catholic clergy, especially Bishop Jerzy Petkiewicz.³⁷ Overall, one gets the impression that Valančius's *Samogitian Diocese* is a dispassionate chronicle of his diocese. He cited his sources carefully, and he used a variety of them like archival materials, manuscripts, printed material, works of the then known chroniclers from Kojalowicz to Strykowski, diocesan archives as well as the works of Daukantas and Narbutt. But Valančius also made factual mistakes,³⁸ and his research was not exhaustive. Only in comparison to Daukantas and Narbutt does Valančius seem like a more critical historian. He did not embellish his history with transparently legendary incidents like the cutting down of the pagan oak tree, which Daukantas accepted as fact. Yet, Valančius recounts that pagan Lithuania had a high priest [Krivė Krivaitis], a Lithuanian version of a druid. The idea of a pagan high priest first appears in the chronicles of Peter Dusburg and Simon Gunau; no evidence, however, exists of such a priest in either old Lithuanian or old Baltic religions. Although the better historian, Valančius only dealt with one diocese, whereas Daukantas wrote about a nation. Of course, Daukantas and Valančius had different agendas in writing their histories. Valančius's religious identity may have taken precedence over his national identity; where Daukantas was a nationalist, Valančius remained equivocal.

Valančius organized the *Samogitian Diocese* into two books, the first of which is a rather dry chronology of bishops and their careers. He burdens the lay reader with parochial matters that include inventories of parishes and priests.³⁹ He includes a twenty-seven page table that assesses the financial state of all the Samogitian parishes in 1841. Valančius mentions the names of patrons, amounts donated, and dilapidated wooden churches that need to be rebuilt in brick. Documentation for this information no longer exists, making the *Samogitian Diocese* sometimes the only source for historians researching Samogitia.

Part Two of the *Samogitian Diocese* deals with a greater variety of topics, from education to monasticism to church synods to ethnographic descriptions of Samogitian life. In general, Valančius's ethnographic portraits and his descriptions of the Protestants entertain the reader more than the clerical history. When he starts preaching about language usage, he is less interesting. He repeats his argument for using Lithuanian in preaching to the peasantry. It served a double purpose since Lithuanian would have been a more effective weapon in the struggle against paganism and Protestantism.⁴⁰

Polish and Lithuanian historians have given Valančius's *Samogitian Diocese* rave reviews, but one wonders why. He airs quite a bit of dirty laundry over all sorts of petty intrigues, minor thefts of sacred objects, complaints about Jesuits and Piarists, and much that seems like ecclesiastical rumors or a polemic meant for the clergy. By recounting much gossip and concerns about behavior, Valančius implies a need for reform and sets a standard for his diocese.

Valančius wrote about the Lithuanian state tangentially, often sounding like a preacher rather than a historian, especially as he discusses Samogitia's economic decline starting with the 1831 insurrection.⁴¹ Yet, he gives the impression of being respectful to the established authority of the Polish clergy, the landlords, and the Russian government. Whereas Daukantas saw Jogaila as a villain in Lithuanian history, Valančius did not portray any conflict between Jogaila and his cousin Vytautas. As a Christian king Jogaila deserved the respect of the Lithuanians. In another twist, Valančius claimed that the Teutonic Knights imposed Christianity on Lithuania, but Jogaila and Vytautas performed the actual christening of Lithuania, with the Poles almost absent from the 1387 event. Valančius is also something

of a determinist in his belief that inevitably Lithuania would have accepted Christianity without pressure from anyone.⁴²

Valančius produced two other works of historical interest. In 1872 he wrote *Pasakojimas Antano Tretininko* [The Tale of Anthony Tretininkas], which was published in America in 1891. The second work he never meant to publish. He left behind five notebooks of his memoirs written in Polish,⁴³ which were collected, translated and edited by Juozas Tumas-Vaižgantas (1869-1933),⁴⁴ entitled *Pastabos pačiam sau* [Remarks to Myself].⁴⁵

Remarks to Myself is among the most interesting works ever written by Valančius. Although much of the book deals with personal memories of his years in the seminary, he gives an insight into his world and the world of mid-nineteenth-century Lithuania. Again, he shows his conservatism by writing about 1848 and his fear of revolution in Poland because of what happened in Italy, France, and Germany.⁴⁶ Valančius writes a captivating account of the soldiers returning home after serving in the Russian army in Poland in 1848 and spreading cholera in Samogitia.⁴⁷ Furthermore, he writes about his audience with tsar Nicholas I, recalling a conversation between himself and the tsar. The tsar tells Valančius,

I am most concerned that a foreign influence does not come into my state; therefore I trust that you, the bishop, with your influence would stop the walking over of our subjects into Prussia. "I am concerned, most enlightened Sir!" answered the bishop. "What is the mood in Samogitia these days?" The tsar asked further. "In 1831 that land transgressed against us." "That is correct most enlightened Lord!" answered the bishop. "But the Samogitians would have never done something like that if it had not been for the chaos in Poland. Our lords, mostly Germans, followed the lead of the Poles. And although I did not like that, I can guarantee that this will not repeat itself, that is, if no foreign power comes in and orders the residents to pick up arms." The tsar then smashed his fist on the table and said: "I am not afraid of a foreign power; having a war at home is worse." With an affectionate face he bowed and said "Goodbye, bishop." He wanted to kiss the bishop's hand, but out of shyness the bishop did not allow the tsar to kiss his hand.⁴⁸

The tsar's attitude toward a liberal Prussia, the blame Valančius put on the Poles for the 1831 insurrection, the reference to a foreign power (most likely France), and their mutual deference, tell us more about Valančius's fears than about the character of the tsar. But there was also suspicion on the tsar's part, as evidenced later when Nicholas I sent spies to check on Valančius's activities during the Crimean war. After the spies would report back to their superiors, the government usually fined Valančius for some minor infraction.

In his memoirs Valančius gives an account of the 1863 insurrection from the local view point of Varniai, the diocesan see. The insurrectionaries angered Valančius more for their thievery than for any political issue over which Valančius and the insurrectionaries might have disagreed. He also disliked the insurrectionaries' manifesto, which told the Lithuanians to consider themselves Poles now.⁴⁹ Valančius continued his memoirs, but he often got bogged down in diocesan or parochial matters, although occasionally he wrote about how a parish fared in the 1863 insurrection. Valančius did not write his memoirs chronologically. In between church matters, he put in some short biographies of famous Samogitians such as Daukantas and Iwinski. Ultimately, *Remarks to Myself* is not a history nor does one get a clear picture of Valančius's Lithuanian national identity from it. Its strength lies in Valančius's description of events from a local perspective.

The Tale of Anthony Tretininkas is a series of children's stories told by a fictitious teacher Anthony, who taught in an underground elementary school. Between the stories about a magical country of dogs, Valančius included stories about the 1863 insurrection, in which he preached about the futility of the uprising. Anthony also tells the children about Lithuanian castles, and then Valančius proceeded to list all of the castle ruins in Lithuania. Anthony entertains the children with stories of the "blood thirsty" Teutonic Knights. Valančius mentioned some of the feats of the Lithuanian medieval Grand Duke Gediminas and the Lithuanian King Mindaugas. Valančius even cited some of the sources for his stories. In other words, he included footnotes in a children's book. In spite of his label as a critical historian, Valančius relied primarily on Narbutt's *History of the Lithuanian Nation*, Voigt's *History of Prussia*, and Peter Dusburg's chronicles. *The Tale of Anthony Tretininkas* is a charming little book, but it is not

history. At best, it is a popularization meant to instruct peasants how to read and behave.-

After the 1863 uprising, under Russian pressure Valančius may have become more Lithuanian, but when he wrote *Samogitian Diocese* in 1848, he did not have the prerequisite anti-Polonism to be a conscious nationalist like Daukantas. Valančius manifests his Lithuanian national identity in the *Samogitian Diocese*, but it is based on language and region not on feeling. In this sense he was more of a provincial Samogitian than Daukantas and the later *Auszra* nationalists, who no longer saw Samogitia and Lithuania as two separate places.

Concluding that Valančius was a better historian than Daukantas also seems too simplistic. At times Daukantas could be a critical historian, whereas sometimes Valančius's concerns with church matters seem trivial. The biggest difference between Daukantas and Valančius is their view of what Lithuania was. Where Daukantas saw a nation and a state separated from Poland, Valančius saw a Samogitian diocese where religious issues took precedence over culture and politics. Even when Valančius complained about the appointment of Polish bishops to Samogitia who had no knowledge of the language or the people, he was not blatantly anti-Polish like Daukantas. Unlike bishop Baranauskas, no one can question Valančius's Lithuanian credentials, but he seems too conservative, too careful, ultimately too concerned with religion to be a proto-nationalist. Where Daukantas did not care about the insurrections because he thought they were Polish affairs, Valančius proclaimed his opposition to the insurrections for pragmatic reasons. He knew they would not succeed.

Valančius echoed Stanevičius and Jucevičius in writing that, "In our time period it seems that people have run out of things to do and so they find happiness in old things. Learned men are collecting all sorts of antiques and writing new books for all the people."⁵⁰ Clearly Valančius knew of the Lithuanistics movement, but he wrote his *Samogitian Diocese* three years before becoming a bishop. After his consecration, his activities became more political. Essentially he no longer wrote history.

Valančius's contribution to Lithuanian historiography rests on the *Samogitian Diocese*. It stands out as a scientific contrast to the works of the Romantic writers. The problem with Valančius's work is that it

was too narrow in scope to help in the formation of a national consciousness. It furthered Lithuanian historiography but not Lithuanian nationalism. Nor did Valančius create a scientific school of historiography. In this respect Stanevičius preceded Valančius in attempting to write scientific histories. Essentially Valančius's political and social work in the Lithuanian national rebirth was too important and too multifaceted for him to spend time researching Lithuania's past.

NOTES

1. Jerzy Plater belonged to the same family as the famous 1831 insurrectionary Emily Plater. For a long while it was assumed that a large estate owner like Plater would not have known the Lithuanian language and that any references to his having understood Lithuanian could be explained as a Lithuanian exaggeration. In 1959 two of his manuscripts were found. "Materiały do historyi literatury języka Litewskiego" [Materials for the History of Literature in the Lithuanian Language], and in the Lithuanian language, "Trumpa žinia apie tą iszdavimą lietuviszkos Biblijos Londone" [Short Notice about the Publication of the Lithuanian Bible in London], Simas Sužiedėlis and Juozas Jakštas, eds. *Encyclopedia Lituanica* (Boston: Kapočius, 1975), s.v. "George Plater," by Aleksandras Plateris.

2. Simonas Stanevičius, *Grammatica Brevis Linguae Lituanicae seu Samogiticae* (Vilnius: Neuman, 1829) in Simonas Stanevičius, *Raštai* [Writings], ed. Jurgis Lebedys (Vilnius: Vaga, 1967), 442. It is worth contrasting Stanevičius's attitude in his book to Ksawier Bohusz's "Letter to Adam Czartoryski 1808 Warsaw," in Maciūnas's *Lituanistinis Sajūdis*, 309. In this letter Bohusz complains about what he found during his excursion searching for Lithuanian documents and ruins. He writes that, "there is political apathy and the opinion that it is not worth bothering with things that are unnecessary."

3. Stanevičius, "Szlōwy Żemaycziu," in *Raštai*, 64.

4. Michał Baliński and Timotej Lipiński, *Starożytna Polska pod względem historycznym, geograficznym i statystycznym opisana* [Ancient Poland with Regards to History, Geography and Statistics] (Warsaw: Ogelbrand, 1886), vol. 2, *Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie* [The Grand Duchy of Lithuania], by Michał Baliński, 409.

5. Stanevičius, *Wyjaśnienie Mythologii Litewskiej* [Explanation of Lithuanian Mythology], in *Ibid.*, 219.

6. *Ibid.*, 219.

7. Stanevičius, *Daynas Žemaycziu* [Songs of the Samogitians], in *Ibid.*, 72.

8. Stanevičius, *Wyjaśnienie Mythologii Litewskiej*, in *Ibid.*, 222.

9. *Ibid.*, 227.

10. Stanevičius, "Letter to Narbutt, 10 September 1836, Raseiniai," in *Ibid.*, 425.

11. Stanevičius, *Wyjaśnienie Mythologii Litewskiej*, in *Ibid.*, 273.

12. M. Davainis-Silvestravičius [pseud. V] "Obituary of Aleksandras Fromas," *Varpas*, 6 (Tilsit), June 1901, 72.

13. According to Valančius "the government intended to make the whole country Russian and convert the Lithuanians and Samogitians to Orthodoxy," in Motiejus

Valančius, *Pastabos pačiam sau* [Notes to Myself], trans. and ed. Juozas Tumas-Vaižgantas (Klaipėda: Ryto, 1929), 75. The arch conservative Pius IX may have had more to do with Valančius's temperance movement and Valančius's stance on the 1863 Insurrection than any of Valančius's own views.

14. Saulius Girnius, "Bishop Motiejus Valančius: A Man for All Seasons," *Lituanus*, 22, no. 2 (1976): 24.

15. *Ibid.*, 25.

16. Kostas Korsakas, ed., *Lietuvių Literatūros Istorija*, [History of Lithuanian Literature], vol. 2 (Vilnius: Valstybinė Politinės ir Mosklinės Literatūros Leidykla, 1957-1968), 51.

17. Adam Bromke, *Poland's Politics: Idealism versus Realism* (Cambridge: University Press, 1967). There is no tradition of realism or idealism in Lithuanian politics. The Lithuanian-American historian Vincas Trumpa disagrees with this view. He sees in Valančius's work a tradition of realism that extended into the twentieth century. See his *Lietuva XIX Amžiuje*. Nor is there any clear division in Lithuanian historiography of a critical or a romantic school of historiography as in the case of Polish history. Valančius and to a lesser extent Stanevičius were less fanciful in their works than Narbutis or Daukantas.

18. Vytautas Merkys, "Žemaičių Vyskupystė," Introduction in Motiejus Valančius, *Raštai* [Writings], K. Korsakas et al., eds., vol. 2 (Vilnius: Vaga, 1972), 11.

19. Valančius's two tsars were Nicholas I and Alexander II. Because Valančius was neither the tsar's nor the pope's first choice for bishop of Samogitia, the tsar and the pope thought that Valančius was at least not the other's stooge. Vaclovas Biržiška, *Vyskupo Motiejaus Valančiaus Biografijos Bruožai* [A Biographical Sketch of Bishop Motiejus Valančius] (Brooklyn: Aidų, 1952), 33. Murav'ev was the governor general of the Northwest Territory, and the tsar gave him extraordinary powers to suppress the 1863 Insurrection. He initiated a reign of terror in Lithuania and a period of intense Russification.

20. Western scholars have also attributed extraordinary achievements to Valančius, making him into the single most important figure in the fostering of a Lithuanian national rebirth. David Kirby, *The Baltic World 1772-1993: Europe's Northern Periphery in and Age of Change* (New York: Longman, 1995), 134. Edward C. Thaden, *Russia's Western Borderlands, 1710-1870* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 142. Piotr S. Wandycz, *The Lands of Partitioned Poland 1795-1918* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1984), 244-245.

21. Juozas Jasaitis, *Motiejus Valančius* (Kaunas: Šviesa, 1994), 23.

22. Lvov quoted in *Ibid.*, 24.

23. Vilnius education district, guardian's report, submitted to the Vilnius General Governor, 25 April 1884, no. 2415. Translated and prepared by Kazys Misius in Egidijus Motieka et al., eds., *Atgimimas ir Katalikų Bažnyčia* [The Rebirth and the Catholic Church], vol. 7 *Lietuvių Atgimimo Istorijos Studijos*, 411-423.

24. Ieva Šenavičienė, "Simono Daukanto Bičiuliai Peterburge" [Simonas Daukantas's Friends in St. Petersburg], *Kultūros Barai*, 11 (Vilnius: 1995): 64-70. Historians had assumed that Daukantas influenced Valančius to write his *Žemaitiu Wiskupistę* in the Lithuanian language rather than Polish. Šenavičienė provides evidence to contest this assumption.

25. Valančius, "Letter to Jan Gintyło, 21 January 1845, St. Petersburg," in Valančius, *Raštai*, vol. 1, 503.

26. The "Lithuanian Metrics" were an archive of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania made up of all the state documents from 1386 to 1794. They were later transferred from Vilnius to Cracow to Warsaw, and today they are in Moscow.

27. Valančius, "Letter to Adam Zawadzki, 4 March 1855, Varniai," in *Raštai*, vol. 1, 513.

28. Valančius quoted in Zenonas Ivinskis, "Simonas Daukantas ir jo palikimas Lietuvos Istorijos srityje" [Simonas Daukantas and His Legacy in the Area of Lithuanian History], *Aidai*, 9 (Brooklyn: November 1964): 392.

29. Vaclovas Biržiška, "Iš Vysk. M. Valančiaus Veiklos" [From Bishop M. Valančius's Activities], *Mūsų Senovė*, 2, no. 3 (Kaunas: 1938): 355-371; reprint in Egidijus Motieka et al., eds., *Atgimimas ir Katalikų Bažnyčia*, vol. 7, *Lietuvių Atgimimo Istorijos Studijos*, 374.

30. Valančius used Lithuanian with the clergy on only two occasions. When Murav'ev forbade the use of the Polish language in all official documents, Valančius addressed his clergy in Lithuanian. In general he pressured his clergy to read more theology, of course written in Polish. But he also demanded that his priests speak both Polish and Lithuanian. In one case, in which a priest had not learned the Lithuanian language, after a number of years serving in a Lithuanian parish, Valančius called the priest a scoundrel for having wasted time and money in not fulfilling his pastoral duties in the Lithuanian language, *Ibid.*, 374.

31. Thaden, *Russia's Western Borderlands, 1710-1870*, 142.

32. Rimantas Vėbra, *Lietuvos katalikų dvasininkija ir visuomeninis judėjimas* [The Lithuanian Catholic Clergy and Social Activism] (Vilnius: Mintis), 11.

33. Vytautas Merkys, "Žemaičių Vyskupystė," Introduction in Valančius, *Raštai*, vol. 2, 11.

34. Jul. B., "Wołonczewski," *Encyklopedyja powszechna* [Universal Encyclopedia], vol. 27 (Warsaw: 1868), 778, quoted in *Ibid.*, 11.

35. Valančius, "Letter to Daukantas, 23 April 1848, Varniai," in Valančius, *Raštai*, vol. 1., 506.

36. *Biskupstwo żmujdzkie opisał Ks. Biskup Maciej Wołonczewski; ze żmujdzkiego na język polski przełożył i niektóre przypisy historyczne dodał M. Hryszkiewicz; z przedmowa Stanisława Smolki* (Cracow: Gebethner, 1898).

37. As Bishop of Samogitia, Petkiewicz (ca. 1530-1574) unsuccessfully tried to stem the tide of Protestantism. Even though he did not originate the story, Valančius believed sources which claimed that Petkiewicz loved hunting more than religious matters. Valančius, *Žemaitiu Wiskupistę*, in *Raštai*, vol. 2, 83.

38. Valančius writes that Sigismund August decreed religious toleration in 1576. *Ibid.*, 377. Sigismund August died in 1572.

39. *Ibid.*, 197.

40. *Ibid.*, 231.

41. *Ibid.*, 38.

42. *Ibid.*, 41.

43. 1. "Rozmaite wiadomości zebrane przez Kieżdza Macieja Wołonczewskiego" [Various Information Collected by Rev. M. Wołonczewski] 1839-1843, Lithuanian Academy of Science Library Manuscript Section. 2. "Rozmaite wiadomości zebrane" 1843-1857, Mažvydas Republic Library ethnographic Lore Section. 3. "Rozmaite wiadomości zebrane 1858-1859" 4. "Pamiętnik Domowy" [Home diary] before 1873; Vilnius University Library Manuscript Section. 5. "Wiadomość o czynościch

pasterskich Biskupa Macieja Wołonczewskiego" [Information about Bishop M. Wołonczewski's Pastoral Works]. All the manuscripts are in Vilnius.

44. Juozas Tumas-Vaižgantas is one of the most famous names in Lithuanian literature. Being a priest from a younger generation, Tumas-Vaižgantas was an ardent nationalist and very anti-Polish.

45. Vaclovas Biržiška published and commented on those parts that Tumas-Vaižgantas omitted in *Mūsų Senovėje* 2, 3 (Kaunas: 1938 and 1940).

46. Motiejus Valančius, *Pastabos pačiam sau*, trans. and ed. Juozas Tumas-Vaižgantas (Klaipėda: Ryto, 1929), 29.

47. *Ibid.*, 32. For some reason the Jews had a higher mortality rate than the Lithuanians, but Valančius does not attribute this to the will of God or the lack of hygiene among the Jews. Anti-Semitism was prevalent among the activists of the Lithuanian national rebirth. Valančius's rationalism made him one of the least anti-Semitic figures in Lithuania.

48. *Ibid.*, 35.

49. *Ibid.*, 61.

50. Valančius, *Žemaičių Vyskupystė*, 23.

VII

THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF AUSZRA AND THE AUŠRININKAI

Homines historiarum ignari semper sunt pueri.

Roman saying

Die Sprache ist unsere Geschichte.

JACOB GRIMM

AUSZRA

The first Lithuanian national newspaper, *Auszra* [Dawn], was published in 1883 near Tilsit. It symbolizes the start of the Lithuanian national rebirth. Of course, no one publication, person, or event can start a movement that had a variety of social, economic, political and psychological aspects. Nevertheless, *Auszra* provides an insight into the world of the late nineteenth-century Lithuanian intelligentsia. Although only forty issues of *Auszra* ever appeared, it had immense significance. *Auszra* showed Lithuanians that they were not just peasants but a nation. It crystallized many ill-defined ideas of the Lithuanistics movement. Before *Auszra*'s appearance the issue of a separate national identity for Lithuanians had not been fully articulated. *Auszra* went beyond expressing a national identity. It started to flirt with Lithuanian nationalism, that is, with the idea of a Lithuanian nation-state.

Most of the pre-*Auszra* periodicals were odd series, religious or non-political publications. A German scholarly society, the *Litauische Litterrarische Gesellschaft*, also put out an informational bulletin but its antiquarian German outlook did not appeal to the new Lithuanians like Dr. Jonas Basanavičius (1851-1927).¹ During the press ban, Lithuanians published in Prussia and the United States. The Germans financed or controlled newspapers like *Lietuviška Ceitung* (1878-1939) and *Keleivis* (1849-1880), which were intended for distribution in Lithuania Minor (Prussia), not in Russian Lithuania. Even though some Lithuanian readers complained about the Gothic letters used in Prussia, at least the Germans allowed the Lithuanians to print in a form of the Latin alphabet.

An earlier version of *Auszra* began modestly when a group of Lithuanian students in Moscow produced a hand-written and mimeographed paper as early as 1880-1881. When the Russian government denied them permission to publish a Lithuanian newspaper in Vilnius, Jonas Šliūpas (1861-1944), a University of Moscow student, proposed to publish *Auszra* in Prussia. The printer, Jurgis Mikšas, objected to Šliūpas because he considered Šliūpas a radical, and so Mikšas and Vištelis, another editor, chose Basanavičius as the editor. They sent *Auszra* in sealed envelopes to selected addresses in Lithuania, or book smugglers carried it across the German-Russian border.

The *Auszra* period (1883-1886) did not produce historians of the caliber that the University of Vilnius had in the early nineteenth century. Not one professionally trained historian numbered among the editors and writers of *Auszra*. Nevertheless, several of the *Aušrininkai*² like Basanavičius and Šliūpas had some undergraduate training in history. Though Basanavičius did some original research in Lithuanian history, ethnography and folklore, he was primarily a publicist who evolved into a politician eventually becoming sympathetic to the nationalist party in inter-war Lithuania. Like Basanavičius, many *Aušrininkai* were historians or poets at heart who needed a profession like medicine to make a living.

Fostering the use of the Lithuanian language may have had primacy in *Auszra*, but promoting the study of a national history was also important for the *Aušrininkai*. Basanavičius, the patriarch of the Lithuanian national rebirth and the first editor of *Auszra*, wrote in the introduction to the first issue that,

...we will concern ourselves with spreading among our brothers news about our nation's ancient deeds...we will not forget to collect and write about all sorts of Lithuanian monuments and ruins from which we can learn about the life, nature, habits, and the old religion of our grandparents.³

The first issue of *Auszra* included an article about Lithuania's castles and an article about Daukantas. The *Aušrininkai* tried to "naturalize"⁴ Lithuanian ruins, and they rediscovered a "new national hero," Daukantas.

Auszra appeared during the press ban, which lasted from 1864 to 1904. After the enthusiastic participation of Lithuanians in the 1863 insurrection, the Russian authorities, partly in retribution, partly in the belief that the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was an ancient Russian territory, decided it was time to Russify the Lithuanians. Russian administrators concluded that they would achieve their goal by breaking the Polish szlachta in Lithuania.⁵ In a letter to the minister of the interior the governor general of Vilnius, K. Kaufman wrote, "Now it is high time to replace the Polish influence in Lithuania not only with the Orthodox faith, but also with the Russian nation's laws...and at the same time to retain the ancient historical ties that have existed between Lithuania and Russia."⁶ A policy of forced Russification would seek to replace the process of cultural Polonization in Lithuania.

Nevertheless, the way in which the Russians implemented the press ban furthered Polonization. The ban forbade the publication and importation of Lithuanian books and periodicals printed in what was the Polonized Latin alphabet used by the Lithuanians. The Russians permitted the use of a specially adapted Cyrillic script called "grazhdanka." By changing the alphabet, the Russians hoped the Lithuanian language would replace Polish, thus Lithuanian literacy would be in the Cyrillic alphabet thereby drawing the Lithuanians and Russians closer to each other. About fifty Lithuanian books, primarily religious, appeared in the grazhdanka alphabet. Virtually all were government publications. Bishop Valančius gave his imprimatur only to the early editions. Later he came out in opposition to the press ban. Paradoxically, the Russians allowed the sale of Polish books in Lithuania. This limited the spread of Lithuanian literature to older Lithuanian prayer books and religious writings. With time, the older Lithuanian books began to disappear, and Polish books filled the vacuum.

Partly because of the intellectual groundwork that Daukantas, Valančius, and the learned Samogitians of the Lithuanistics movement had laid, the press ban provoked a sharp Lithuanian response that culminated in a successful movement of book smugglers and the publication of nationalist newspapers like *Auszra* and its successors. Although Russification failed to turn Lithuanians into Orthodox Russians, it played a role in driving a wedge between Poles and

Lithuanians. The political struggle between Poles and Russians for Polish independence continued, but Lithuanians would now begin to seek cultural autonomy for themselves and no longer follow the lead of Poles.

For a variety of reasons, such as the closing of the University of Vilnius, the press ban, and the unsuccessful insurrections, young Lithuanians had to go elsewhere to experience the freedom of engaging in something other than the limited economic or intellectual opportunities offered in Lithuania. Some emigrated to America, where because of their Catholicism, parishes lumped them together with the Poles. Richer peasant families could send their sons to the Universities of Moscow and St. Petersburg, but Russians also regarded Lithuanian Catholics as Poles. Away from home the émigré learned that he was a Lithuanian and that he resented being associated with the Poles. Precisely where the Lithuanian national rebirth started is beyond the scope of this study, but scholars seem to agree it was outside of Lithuania Major.⁷

The *Aušrininkai* represented a post-serfdom generation made up of the children of well-to-do peasants. Although many of them received an education in Russian universities, they all had a strong Polish cultural background. If the *Aušrininkai* wanted to learn about Lithuania's past, they did so in Polish. As was the case of the older generation of activists of the Lithuanistics movement, the *Aušrininkai* corresponded among themselves and kept their diaries in Polish. Many of the them, simultaneously published in Polish or Russian newspapers and in *Auszra*. The Poles often learned about *Auszra*'s hostility toward them through the articles of the *Aušrininkai* published in the Polish language St. Petersburg magazine *Kraj* [Homeland]. The *Aušrininkai* were not as closely tied to the idea of a joint Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as the Lithuanistics movement participants had been. Whereas the older generation had maintained their loyalty to the idea of the Union of Lublin, the *Aušrininkai* would not. From the days of the old University of Vilnius, Daukantas's voice echoed more strongly in *Auszra* than anyone else's.

The *Aušrininkai* were what Józef Chlebowczyk calls the "visionary-activists" who personally sacrificed their lives for a cause that their contemporaries often perceived as a mirage.⁸ "Awakening" Lithuanians to their national identity in the nineteenth century

certainly seemed impractical. While many pre-*Auszra* activists had been unclear about their national identity, essentially being hybrid Polish-Lithuanians, *Auszra* resurrected Daukantas's anti-Polonism and definition of what a Lithuanian was. A Lithuanian could not be a Pole, a Russian, a Jew, or a German. Of course socioeconomic antagonisms between lord and peasant also played a role in anti-Polish attitudes. A literate Lithuanian peasant no longer wanted the domination of the Polish lord. The Polish szlachta had failed twice in its leadership role during the insurrections. The insurrection of 1863 marked the last time Lithuanians would fight for an independent Poland. Polish independence would mean a permanent union of Lithuania with Poland. Some Poles and Lithuanians considered the breakup of Polish-Lithuanian solidarity tantamount to playing into the hands of the Russians. Despite this sentiment, Lithuanians moved in the direction of independence with *Auszra* as their banner. To be sure independence was unthinkable in 1883, but clearly *Auszra* reflected a nationalist movement that became stronger with time.

Auszra had articles on every imaginable subject, including reports on life in America, book reviews, poetry, history, politics, health, agriculture, and ethnography. Basanavičius declared in the first issue that *Auszra* would deal only with cultural matters, and *Auszra* published more poems and articles on history than anything else. Its greatest importance may have been in standardizing the Lithuanian language. But in spite of Basanavičius's cultural interests and apolitical pronouncements, *Auszra* very quickly also took up a nationalist agenda. Because the contributors printed it in Prussia and distributed it in the Russian empire, they showed a certain deference to, if not fear of, both the Kaiser and the Tsar. Because the Lithuanians hoped to regain the right to publish in the Latin alphabet, they did not want to unduly offend the Tsarist government. Of course, this deference did not have to carry over to the Poles.

In a relatively short time, from 1883 to 1886, *Auszra* had a succession of five editors. The two most important editors were Basanavičius and Šliūpas. Basanavičius represented the liberal romantic view, whereas Šliūpas represented a socialist position.⁹ While there was no ideological consistency, these two dominant figures of *Auszra* determined its outlook. The differences between Basanavičius and Šliūpas did not represent a major disagreement

between the two. Culture, language, economics, and social status took precedence over religion. Basanavičius and Šliūpas represented a younger intelligentsia with its own nationalist agenda, who did not maintain the institutional loyalties that the Lithuanian clergy did with the Polish hierarchy. In an article about Simonas Daukantas, Šliūpas criticized Bishop Valančius for mistreating him.¹⁰ Such criticism of Valančius was tantamount to anti-clericalism. Misunderstanding the secularism of Basanavičius and Šliūpas, peasants would denounce Šliūpas as an atheist. These two editors made *Ausra* combative, secular, and nationalist.

Šliūpas introduced politics and economics into what ostensibly was supposed to be a cultural newspaper. He wrote, "It is not enough to love Lithuania and its heroic past. I cannot agree that the sole reason for Lithuania's downfall was forgetting our language. We must look for Lithuania's downfall in the living standards of the people."¹¹

During the late nineteenth century, Romanticism reigned over Lithuanian historiography but at times Šliūpas rejected this type of sentimental idealization of history. Because both Šliūpas and Basanavičius brought their scientific backgrounds in medicine to the study of history, they could be more critical. As will be seen later, however, Šliūpas was never consistent. Though often wrong in their historical theories and research, they believed that history should be based on facts. Facts could answer questions such as 1) who are the Lithuanians? 2) where did they come from? 3) what are their cultural achievements worth?¹² In many ways the *Aušrininkai* picked up where Daukantas had left off, but considering that almost twenty years had past since Daukantas's death, they had not progressed a great deal beyond Daukantas's and Narbut's simplistic idealization of Lithuania's past. Though they usually did not specify their sources, when the *Aušrininkai* cited a source, they routinely relied on the same old Strykowski, Narbut, and Kraszewski. They were not yet fully aware of Lithuanian sources.

For all of the articles about the Russians, German, and Jews, the most consistent theme throughout *Ausra* was its anti-Polonism. "Hatred of Poles," was not *Ausra's* slogan as some Polish authors have claimed, but it could have been.¹³ Basanavičius set the tone for all of *Ausra's* history when he wrote,

Who knows us better than the Poles.... In the name of love and fraternity we became one with the Poles in our political life, and some Lithuanian boyars took up the Polish language...but after many hardships the Poles do not consider us equal.... What have the Poles done for us after these hundreds of years? They did not even let us have our own church services. *Dziennik Poznański* congratulates us for saving our language but in reality they want to destroy us.¹⁴

He wrote further,

Well okay! The Poles say that they raised and preserved etc. our past in their poetry. But who we ask wrote those songs about Lithuania's past, which have been made famous throughout Europe in the name of Polish poetry? The answer is short: Lithuanians! Adam Mickiewicz, L. Kondratowicz, J. I. Kraszewski, T. Lenartowicz, Chodźko, Odyniec, Asnyk, and many more lesser poets -- have Lithuanian, not Polish last names; and in their veins flows Lithuanian blood. If they did not write in Lithuanian about their beloved Lithuanian past, then that is the fault of Polish influence on Lithuania.... Naruszewicz, Lelewel, Aleksandrowicz, Girsztatt, Miskucki, and other famous scholars support the Lithuanians. M. Copernicus had nothing in common with the Poles, because he was a Germanized Prussian, in whose veins flowed Lithuanian blood. Oh, Kościuszko, the world famous commander, was he not a Lithuanian?¹⁵

Historical truth is no longer the goal; nationalism is.

Many Poles sympathetic to the Lithuanian national rebirth did not know what to make of this Lithuanian antipathy.¹⁶ Some Poles and Lithuanians tried to reconcile their differences. However, every attempt back-fired and aggravated relations further.¹⁷ The Polish newspaper *Dziennik Poznański* [Poznań Daily] and *Ausza* especially went at each other's throats. After initially congratulating *Ausza*, *Dziennik Poznański* could not leave unchallenged the various accusations made against the Poles. The Lithuanians found the view of the *Dziennik Poznański* that the Lithuanians were "Poles who spoke differently" particularly distasteful. For its part, the *Dziennik Poznański* found any talk of Lithuanian autonomy separate from Poland but within the Russian empire as Muscovite inspired.¹⁸

Tactically, the Lithuanians did not want to antagonize unduly the Russians or the Germans; the *Aušrininkai*, however, were not merely Russian or German stooges trying to destroy Lithuanian-Polish solidarity. In 1953 Mykolas Biržiška explained who published *Auszra*:

The Poles considered it the work of the Muscovites aimed against the Poles, the Muscovites considered it the work of the Poles or the Prussians against the Muscovites, while the Prussians believed it was the work of the Muscovites and Poles aimed against the Prussians. Few outsiders could imagine that it really was the work of the Lithuanians. These Lithuanians owed nothing to anyone. *Auszra* tried to avoid criticizing the Prussians because the paper was located there, and they were careful about alienating the Muscovites, hoping to regain the right to publish their own newspaper.¹⁹

It seems that Poles could not understand the Lithuanian attitude that the Poles were oppressors. Nor could the Poles understand a Lithuanian movement without them.²⁰

In line with this new Lithuanian independence, Basanavičius and the *Aušrininkai* distanced themselves from Polish politics and especially from the 1863 Insurrection. He wrote,

The Lithuanians have never raised their hand against Moscow or Prussia. When the Poles had many of their lords participate in the uprising of 1863 they dragged a minority of the Lithuanians into this affair and that is why the Russians forbade the Lithuanians to publish books. The Russians blamed the Lithuanians for the sins of others...the Poles can print their books not only in Poland but in Vilnius and St. Petersburg....²¹

The problem was that the Polonized upper classes in the territory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania saw their history as a subdivision of Polish history. In an article about Polish-Lithuanian relations, Stanislovas Raila wrote that the Polonized Lithuanian boyars should take their place in the Lithuanian nation. Not only peasants made up the nation. He wrote that the Lithuanians did not require the boyars to reject their Polish language and culture. Nevertheless, the Lithuanians demanded that the lords change their attitudes toward the language and toward the union between Poland and Lithuania.²² Of course,

Lithuanian-Polish antagonism had its roots in class issues rather than politics. The Lithuanian intelligentsia was of peasant origins while the Poles had been their lords. Perhaps the Polonized Lithuanian gentry did not participate in *Auszra* for these social reasons.

Auszra never had a program, nor did it define its goals beyond a desire for a free press and a linguistic nationalism. Its circulation did not surpass one thousand, and although it only lasted three years, it started something. Soon after *Auszra* ceased publication in 1886, new newspapers with a wider readership appeared. The conservative clerical *Šviesa* [Light] and the more militant socialist paper *Varpas* [Bell] appeared soon after *Auszra*'s demise. The *Aušrininkai* had a strong sense of a Lithuanian national identity,²³ but they never addressed the issue of what a Lithuanian state would be like. Only later in their careers did Basanavičius and Šliūpas call for Lithuanian independence. Yet, *Auszra* defined what Lithuanians were and what Lithuanians should do: Lithuanians should become educated and prosperous, should unite and live in Lithuania, should attempt to speak Lithuanian, and perhaps what is most important, they should feel Lithuanian. *Auszra*'s strength lay in its basic idea of Lithuanianness. Ultimately *Auszra*'s weaknesses and inconsistencies were minor. Whether the articles were about cabin-building, history, or health, they defined what a Lithuanian should be. Under Russian and German rule and under Polish cultural domination, the problem of a small ethnic group creating a nation was not at all certain. Nevertheless, the *Aušrininkai* started to articulate Lithuanian nationalism that eventually would inspire a mass movement.

Defining and mapping Lithuania ethnically also began in *Auszra*. The *Aušrininkai* laid to rest any confusion about who the Lithuanians were. The Samogitians, the Highlanders (*Aukštaičiai*)²⁴ and possibly the "Lithuanian szlachta of Polish Culture" were Lithuanians. *Auszra* excluded Poles from the Congress Kingdom and Russians, Germans, and Jews from the Lithuanian nation. Exceptions could be made for those who were particularly active in the Lithuanian movement, but in general blood and history would determine whether a person could be a Lithuanian. Adding language and a sense of belonging to the Lithuanian movement, the *Aušrininkai* began to exclude many of the residents of the old Grand Duchy of Lithuania from their nation. Because the Poles and the Lithuanians were so intermixed culturally,

the Lithuanian reaction against the Poles had to be that much stronger. It was time to choose who you were. You had to be a Pole or a Lithuanian and not some type of hybrid or a citizen of a dead Grand Duchy. Geographically, the *Aušrininkai* kept things vague. Lithuania would include the regions of Samogitia, Vilnius, Grodno, and any place that the *Aušrininkai* believed was populated by Polonized or Russianized Lithuanians.²⁵

The *Aušrininkai* believed that beside idealizing Lithuania's past, history had to elevate the national consciousness. They wanted to use the past as a springboard to the future. In other words, Lithuania's future should be like its medieval past—powerful and great. In contrast to the nineteenth-century cultural, linguistic, and political weakness of Lithuania, the past had relevance to the present as a lesson on how to regain or achieve Lithuania's former greatness.

As much of an atheist bogeyman as Šliūpas was, after he left *Auszra*, interest in it declined. More than anything *Auszra* needed subscribers. Attempts to gain permission for the legal distribution of *Auszra* came to nought. Sending *Auszra* through the mail required sympathetic officials, who did not always exist, whereas many of the book smugglers carrying *Auszra* into Lithuania considered it "pagan" literature.²⁶ Book smugglers often suffered at the hands of tsarist authorities and the conservative Catholic population. By aiming *Auszra* at the intelligentsia, the *Aušrininkai* automatically limited its appeal and reading audience. Peasants bought *Auszra*'s calendar more than the newspaper itself.

The last two editors of *Auszra* were Martynas Jankus (1858-1946)²⁷ and Jurgis Mikšas²⁸ (1862-1903). Neither one of these two well-intentioned Lithuanian patriots had the education or force of character that Basanavičius or Šliūpas had. According to Basanavičius, Jankus accused Mikšas of squandering money that they had intended to use for publishing.²⁹ Petty squabbles abounded. The owner of *Auszra*'s printing press, Mikšas, needed to make a profit, which meant that when Mikšas went broke, *Auszra* closed. As can be seen from the plethora of newspapers which it spawned, *Auszra* closed for financial reasons, not for a lack of interest.

Lithuanians have given the *Auszra* period a special name—*Aušros Gdynė*. It lasted for only three years, and yet it was symboli-

cally a dividing line between the old and new Lithuania. Before 1883, Lithuanian culture was a subdivision of Polish culture. Daukantas and a handful of others may have been exceptions, but the national sentiments expressed by writers like Mickiewicz or Kraszewski were the rule. After 1883 the Lithuanian activists undertook to make their culture "pure." The Lithuanian intelligentsia began deliberately to divest themselves of their Polish ties and influences. A Lithuanian might still speak Polish better than Lithuanian, but publicly he had to make the effort to talk or write Lithuanian. Perhaps because of their own insecurity about the purity of their Lithuanianness, many activists had to shout loudly about how much they hated the Poles to prove to themselves and the Poles that they were in fact Lithuanians. Moreover, *Auszra* forced its readers to choose their national identity. Emotional testimonials abound from people who considered themselves Polish patriots but after reading *Auszra* "awakened" to their "true" Lithuanian identity. While the motives for a change in national identity are often suspect, the sincerity of such conversions should not be automatically impugned.

As much animosity as there was between the two peoples, Poles and Lithuanians lived side by side in Europe and America and would invariably clash with each other over issues such as the language used in church or the spelling of names and ultimately the nationality the Russian or American authorities would label them with. It seems that initially the Lithuanians could not get by without the Poles, whereas by the late nineteenth century the Poles did not want to let go of the Lithuanians.

Some have claimed that *Auszra* introduced its readership to positivism, liberalism, socialism, and even communism.³⁰ While some of the *Aušrininkai* had access to the latest Western European publications, many of the articles in *Auszra* were merely sociological or just too naïve to be socialist. Writers like Šliūpas toyed with socialism and even anarchism but ultimately he was too much of a nationalist to associate himself with either Polish or Russian revolutionaries. Only the context of a late nineteenth-century peasant nation made activists like the editors of *Auszra* seem radical. In reality, most of the *Aušrininkai* were socially and politically conservative. They did not call for any type of revolution.

Historiographically, the Lithuanians were not doing anything that Europeans as a whole were not doing. Many nineteenth century nations created histories connecting their past with ancient civilizations.³¹ Ernest Renan maintained that, "The worship of ancestors is understandably justifiable.... A heroic past, of great men of glory, that is the social principle on which the national idea rests."³² Indeed, if a heroic past is missing the chances of nationalism developing are small.³³ One could learn the Lithuanian language but history had to be inherited, or at least the Lithuanian activists thought so. History linked the Lithuanians with an imagined past. It became a secular religion that could ensure a measure of immortality.³⁴ One of the *Aušrininkai*, Mikołaj Akielewicz, wrote, "A nation's history must be on every individual's lips, only then will the nation be immortal."³⁵ If nationalism became a surrogate religion for the Lithuanians, then *Auszra* became its prayer book. The high priest of this religion was Jonas Basanavičius, the first editor of *Auszra*.

JONAS BASANAVIČIUS

Basanavičius participated in virtually every major event in the creation of the modern Lithuanian state. He took part in its rebirth, and on February 16, 1918, he was the first to sign the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence. Unlike his predecessors in the Lithuanistics movement, Basanavičius did not come from Samogitia nor was he a petty nobleman. Born in Vilkaviškis county in the Congress Kingdom of Poland, Basanavičius attended the high school in Marijampolė. After the 1863 insurrection, the high school's language of instruction changed from Polish to Russian, and the Russians allowed Lithuanian language classes twice a week after school. While in high school, Basanavičius read the works of Strykowski, Długosz, Krömer, and Guagnini. He also recorded Lithuanian folk songs and legends. By 1873 he had graduated from high school and set off for the University of Moscow where he majored in history. The Russians had established a scholarship for Lithuanian students who went to the Marijampolė and Suwałki high schools to attend Moscow University. By offering these scholarships, the Russians hoped to draw prospective Lithuanian students away from Warsaw University. In Moscow he attended the lectures of the famous Russian historian

Sergei Solov'ev (1820-1879). He also began to collect material from the university and Rumiancev libraries for a biography of the Grand Duke Kęstutis (ca. 1300-1382). Because of financial difficulties and the unlikely possibility of getting a teaching position in Lithuania, Basanavičius changed his major to medicine.

After he finished his medical studies, Basanavičius settled in Bulgaria for financial reasons. He lived there intermittently and eventually received Bulgarian citizenship and embroiled himself in Bulgarian politics. The peripatetic Basanavičius traveled throughout Bulgaria, Germany, and Austria; and in fact, for much of his life Basanavičius did not live in Lithuania.³⁶ Although Basanavičius was the symbolic leader of *Auszra*, while in Prague he officially edited only the first three issues. While he continued to contribute to *Auszra*, Basanavičius was a distant figure. He was out of touch with the realities of publishing in Prussia. Nevertheless, he continued to publish Lithuanian songs, riddles, and folk tales in *Mitteilungen der Litauischen Literarischen Gesellschaft* and Lithuanian publications that succeeded *Auszra*. Over a lifetime Basanavičius collected and published more than three hundred songs and approximately one thousand folk tales. Ethnology and history consumed Basanavičius.

History for Basanavičius was more than an avocation. It was his lifelong passion. Although Basanavičius knew of the latest contributions of the social sciences to historical research, his nationalist agenda influenced his view of the past. Much like his predecessors Narbutt, Kraszewski, and Daukantas, Basanavičius believed that by studying the peasantry, the modern historian could discover a nation's history. Having rejected the possibility of supernatural occurrences in history, Basanavičius believed in the validity of using myths and folk culture as a source in understanding a nation's character. Before the historian could accomplish that, Basanavičius thought the historian had to discover the origins of that nation.³⁷

As was true of many Lithuanian activists, the origins of the Lithuanians obsessed Basanavičius. As a historian, Basanavičius considered it his most important task to prove that the Lithuanians were the descendants of the Thracians and Phrygians.³⁸ According to the German historians, von Hellwald, Müller, and Fligier, the Thracians brought civilization to the Greeks.³⁹ If Basanavičius could draw a

connection between the Greeks, Thracians, and Lithuanians, then that would somehow prove the high level of prehistoric Lithuanian culture. While in Vienna and Prague, he collected a library of more than two thousand books on the subject. Traveling in Bulgaria, Basanavičius noticed similarities between Bulgarian and Lithuanian toponyms, customs, and songs. He wrote extensively in German and Lithuanian on this theory.⁴⁰ Even when scholars had disproved Basanavičius's theories, he continued down this intellectual dead end.

The 1880's were also a time of intense biblical studies. Like many Romantics Basanavičius believed that biblical stories and the myths and legends of antiquity could help unravel the mysteries of history. Evidently the Oxford-professor Archibald Seyce's published speech on "The Hittites in Asia Minor" and William Wright's efforts to find the Hittite empire influenced Basanavičius.⁴¹ Basanavičius selected his sources from a variety of disciplines. He took Heinrich Schliemann's discovery of Troy and used it to elaborate his theories. He related *Daedalus and his Labyrinth* and Aesop's fables to Lithuanian stories. Like his predecessors Basanavičius imposed Lithuanian mythology on the Olympic pantheon. He connected many Lithuanian stories to Minoan stories, and he associated Zeus with the Lithuanian God of Thunder. In an arcane argument Basanavičius brought in Herodotus, Thucydides, and Homer to draw his connections between the Thracians, the Trojans, the Greeks, and eventually the Lithuanians. Basanavičius did not create or falsify his sources. He believed in the scientific basis for his theories, and he believed that his writings were more than just nationalist polemics. Nevertheless, if something was useful for his theories but uncorroborated, he would include unproven facts into his writings. Today his theories have almost no scholarly value.

Equally important for Basanavičius were his attempts to relate the Indo-Europeans to the Lithuanians. Basanavičius believed that the Lithuanian language would gain legitimacy if he could prove that it was more ancient than the other European languages. Basanavičius based his research on the findings of Rasmus Rask (1787-1832), the Danish philologist who laid the foundations of the science of comparative linguistics. Rask established the relationship between Lithuanian and the Slav, Greek, and Latin languages. The German linguist Franz Bopp (1791-1867) continued Rask's work, and between

1833 and 1852, he published in six parts *Vergleichende Grammatik des Sanskrit, Zend,* Griechischen, Lateinischen, Lithauischen, Alt-slawischen, Gotischen und Deutschen*. In the light of these discoveries about the inter-relatedness of the Indian and European languages, scholars tried to find the ancestors of the Indo-Europeans. It was a rare romantic nationalist who did not try to equate his own people to the ancestors of the Indo-Europeans.

Basanavičius based his theories about the Thracians and Phrygians on an incomplete understanding of linguistics. Basanavičius realized that the basis of Narbutt's and Daukantas's theories about Lithuania's origins had very little to do with comparative linguistics. Yet, Basanavičius continued using the same methodology of comparing similar sounding words to prove his point. Unfortunately, if one does that, then one must conclude that every European language has its roots in Lithuanian. Basanavičius did not see the evolution of language. He would make leaps in reasoning, finding similarities between nineteenth-century Lithuanian and languages two- to four-thousand years old.

Basanavičius also needed to respond to the accusations made by many medieval and nineteenth-century authors that the pagan Lithuanians "lived almost like animals" or that they were "animals of the forest."⁴² To answer this charge, Basanavičius looked to language. He maintained that because the Lithuanian language was so "perfect," it could not be a barbarian tongue. He also believed that the Lithuanian language had given the Polish language more words than the Lithuanian language borrowed from the Slavs. Basanavičius cited the German folklorist Franz Tetzner (1863-1919), who maintained that the Lithuanians had more songs than anybody in the world.⁴³ According to the German linguist August Schleicher, because the Lithuanian language was older than Sanskrit, it could compete with Latin, Greek, and Indian in the perfection of its form.⁴⁴ Basanavičius also quoted from a host of other German linguists who in the nineteenth century were leaders in their field but whose findings today are outdated.

Basanavičius started to define Lithuania geographically. Instead of seeing Lithuania as the old Grand Duchy, Basanavičius began to see Lithuania in linguistic and ethnic terms. Basanavičius believed that the prehistoric Balts lived in an area much larger than they did in the nineteenth century, as far west as the Oder and Elbe rivers in

Germany. He included Galicia, the Carpathian mountains, and the banks of the Vistula among the areas in which the prehistoric Lithuanians lived.⁴⁵ Again relying on secondary German and Polish sources, Basanavičius went into an exceptionally abstruse and contorted proof for his theory. Basanavičius never specified the borders of Lithuania exactly, but he wanted ones different from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

At times Basanavičius's proofs for his arguments are so disjointed that they look like tangents instead of proofs. He would often extensively examine a single word. In his *Lietuviszkai Trakiszkos Studijos* [Lithuanian Thracian Studies], he wrote a chapter each on the etymology of the words "nation" and "spirit." He combined the ideas of spirit and religion to prove that the Lithuanian sense of nationhood was more advanced than that of the Slavs or the Germans. In an attempt to overwhelm the reader, he would present as many arguments as he could.

Basanavičius also used all of the Polish authors mentioned in the previous chapters of this study. In other words, Basanavičius used a great many secondary sources but did very little original research. One of his few forays into research resulted in a book entitled *Apie senovės pilis* [About Ancient Lithuania's Castles].⁴⁶ Basanavičius collected and reprinted material from his original articles in *Ausra*. In this book he did not describe or scientifically analyze castle ruins, rather he retold popular legends of Lithuanians defending themselves against the Teutonic Knights. After that he would often drift into personal recollections of his youth or a poetic description of castle sites. Imposing his own liberal beliefs onto his descriptions, Basanavičius believed that free Lithuanian workers built castles to defend against the Teutonic Knights and the Poles. He added that today the Lithuanian would be served well to follow their forefathers example.⁴⁷ Basanavičius believed in a Lithuanian nation that would unite the people in a harmonious state free of foreigners and their influences. Similarly in *Lietuvių kryžiai archeologijos šviesoje* [Lithuanian Crosses in the light of Archeology], Basanavičius made some interesting drawings of old folk crosses, but beyond that he wrote a work based primarily on the works of German linguists and Polish historians. Although he published in German, French, and Russian, most of his histories were meant for a Lithuanian audience and not for foreign scholars.

Basanavičius wrote differently for outsiders, either attacking Poles or explaining the Lithuanian position to Russians or Germans. Basanavičius published his most polemical works in the St. Petersburg newspaper *Novoe Vremia*. The two articles, "Po povodu polskich radostej" [The Causes of Polish Happiness, 1883] and *Polaki v Litve* [The Poles in Lithuania, 1884], stirred such a debate between the Polish press and Basanavičius that he received the titles of a *polakožerca* [a Pole hater] and a Muscovite stooge.⁴⁸ Basanavičius may have intended to aggravate Polish-Russian relations. He wanted to show the Russians that the Poles were still holding on to their Lithuanians and Catholics. Basanavičius wanted Russian help in breaking the Polish religious and cultural hold over the Lithuanians but without Russification. Some of the arguments about Polish-Lithuanian relations seem to have been between the Lithuanians themselves, like the poet Antanas Baranauskas and Basanavičius. Baranauskas, the future bishop of Sejny, represented Lithuanians who maintained loyalty to the idea of a Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.⁴⁹ Basanavičius typified a new generation of lay leadership who equated Polonization with the Church. In many ways, Basanavičius's attitude toward the Church was the same as Daukantas's, Narbutt's and Kraszewski's had been. However, Basanavičius repeated this anti-clerical, anti-Polish theme more often than his predecessors. While Basanavičius believed that Lithuania had accepted Christianity from the Poles, he responded to Kraszewski's assertion that the Poles brought Christianity to the Lithuanians, by maintaining that the prehistoric Poles had received their pagan cult from the Lithuanians.⁵⁰

Basanavičius's *Poles in Lithuania* is more militant than his articles in *Auszra*. His position is repetitive, unoriginal, and extreme:

the introduction of Christianity bound its political mission in Lithuania: to destroy the Lithuanian language and in its place substitute Polish, especially in church and schools.... The Poles were concerned about the spread of Polonism and not Christianity.⁵¹

Basanavičius's anti-clericalism seems to have had deeper roots than just Polish-Lithuanian relations. In many ways Basanavičius's views

reflected the secularization of society in nineteenth century Europe.⁵² In spite of his parents' wishes that he become a priest, once Basanavičius left home he essentially became a-religious. He even blamed Christianity for destroying Babylonian and Roman temples.⁵³ Specifically, clerical newspapers like the Polish *Przegląd Katolicki* and the Lithuanian *Vienybė* took offence at Basanavičius lecturing the clergy about the hypocrisy of the church.

A devotion to science seems to have played a role in Basanavičius's anti-clericalism, and so did the arrogance of the church. For a time, during the Valančius years, the church had a monopoly of leading the peasants. After Moscow University and his travels abroad, Basanavičius was far removed from his peasant origins and in no mood to follow Polonized priests. Basanavičius never openly challenged Christian beliefs nor did he formally leave the church. However, his close association with his fellow *Aušrininkas* Jonas Šliūpas, the "atheist pope," made Basanavičius's religious views questionable. Furthermore, Basanavičius could always make Christianity's shortcomings into a nationality issue. If not the Poles, then Basanavičius blamed the Teutonic Knights for destroying the ancient Lithuanian culture and its spirit.⁵⁴ "With the Teutonic Knights and later the Poles having established themselves in our land, our nation's honor, strength, and love of the fatherland disappeared and there began a series of long-suffering ills."⁵⁵ Much like Daukantas before him, Basanavičius linked the Teutonic Knights, the Poles and Christianity with the introduction of serfdom into Lithuania.

In a booklet entitled *Baudžiava Lietuvoje* [Serfdom in Lithuania], Basanavičius used inventories, estate archives, deeds, records of land payment, and, overall, a great deal of documentation. Apart from an occasional excursion into anti-Polish rhetoric, *Serfdom in Lithuania* is a local history of the Bartininkų area in Lithuania. He overwhelmed the reader with minutiae. He used the "Lithuanian Statute" to show how the Poles could gain the best land in Lithuania though the "Statute" prohibited the ownership of land by foreigners.⁵⁶ For all of the details, his message remains the same, the Poles are to blame for almost everything. Basanavičius states that from the Union of Lublin "with Polish culture they also brought all sorts of by-products that this land had never experienced."⁵⁷ Oddly, he writes that the Poles after

the Union of Lublin turned Lithuania into a "szlachta heaven, a Jewish paradise and a peasant's hell."⁵⁸ Although the Poles remained the main target, for Basanavičius the Jews would not be a part of the Lithuanian nation either.⁵⁹

Depending on the argument he wanted to make, Basanavičius understood that a political state could be different from a nation-state. Prior to Basanavičius, the concept of a historical Grand Duchy of Lithuania interfered with the idea of an ethnic Lithuania. In the creation of a nation, people seem to want to know their historical roots. Basanavičius tried to show the historical continuity of the Lithuanian nation and state both for political and psychological reasons. As did many nationalists, Basanavičius believed that there was an unbroken string of history that tied Lithuanians together. Prehistoric, medieval, and nineteenth-century Lithuanians were the same people. Even in politics, Basanavičius did not see the end of Lithuanian history with the Union of Lublin but rather with the last partition in 1795. Conversely, Basanavičius did not want to inherit all of the traditions and history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania because to do so would be to inherit a strong Polish political and cultural legacy as well as an East Slavic heritage.

Culturally, Basanavičius concentrated on ethnographic Lithuania but politically he concerned himself only with ethnolinguistic Lithuania.⁶⁰ Because they had been initially inhabited by the Balts, Basanavičius would include the predominantly Polish Vilnius and Grodno regions into his concept of an ethnolinguistic Lithuania, but it would not include Belarus or Ukraine. The legacy of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania had diverse territorial, linguistic, and cultural aspects. In the late nineteenth century, Lithuanians could not possibly hope for the recreation of a Lithuanian state, but culturally they could invent a new nation—an ethnolinguistic Lithuania. Ostensibly Basanavičius wanted all classes to join this new nation, but culturally and linguistically it had to be Lithuanian. The Polish-speaking upper class would have to change their language and cultural orientation if they wanted inclusion in the Lithuanian nation. Developing a historical consciousness could help in creating this nation, but it could also be an impediment because the historical Grand Duchy had been politically and culturally a Polish szlachta state.

He also took the attitude that Narbut, Jaroszewicz, and Mickiewicz were not Poles but Lithuanians.⁶¹ "There was a time when Kraszewski considered himself a Lithuanian but now he considers himself some sort of Lithuanian-Pole."⁶² He attempted to clarify nationalist terminology by differentiating between a Pole living in Lithuania from a Polish-speaking Lithuanian boyar.⁶³ If *Auszra* and Basanavičius could not reverse Polonization, then at least they could separate themselves from the institutions and social classes that promoted it.

Basanavičius chose to translate into Lithuanian one of Teodor Narbut's most imaginative works: *Graf Kyburg's Journey*. Narbut fabricated this story, which he presented as an undiscovered document. Kyburg was one of eight Teutonic Knight delegates to Vytautas, though the precise nature of his mission was unknown. Essentially Kyburg was a fourteenth-century tourist in Vytautas's court. The actual narrative is difficult to deal with because it was not merely Narbut's forgery but an attempt to fill in some of the gaps in Vytautas's time period with primary sources. Supposedly, Ignacy Onacewicz passed down *Kyburg's Journey* to Narbut. This fanciful account spoke about the grandeur of Vytautas's court. It told of Vytautas's banquet table, where all were equal and therefore more Christian than at a Teutonic Knight's table. In other words, "Kyburg's tale" fit nicely into the nationalist prejudices of Narbut and Basanavičius. Ironically, Narbut and later Basanavičius included footnotes into this forgery, in which they endeavored to show a critical approach to this source by adding comments like "this cannot be proven" or "it is unknown." Neither Narbut nor Basanavičius were complete fools. Narbut was a creative counterfeiter, and Basanavičius a nationalist who used anything that would raise national consciousness.

One may question whether to call Basanavičius a historian at all. Because much of what he wrote was not original and some of it erroneous, Basanavičius's legacy lies more in the realm of cultural activism than dispassionate scholarship. Especially in his *Auszra* days, Basanavičius believed history should serve a useful purpose. Scholarship for its own sake did not interest him. The nineteenth-century present looked bleak for the Lithuanians. The future was unknown. Many of the *Aušrininkai* considered the history of the insurrection as

current events. A hazy distant prehistory became a fertile field for nationalism, imagination, and the latest misunderstandings in linguistics, philology, archeology, and related fields. If somehow Basanavičius could prove that the dawn of civilization started with the ancestors of the Lithuanians, then the veil of inferiority would lift from the Lithuanian peasant consciousness. The socioeconomic realities of a peasant nation may promote class antagonisms but being a member of that peasant nation did not necessarily engender pride. History provided a psychological tool that raised a peasant's self-esteem. One must also keep in mind that Basanavičius was a product of his own time. He was more than a stereotypically isolated Eastern European. While his theories have no lasting scholarly value, he was not merely a nationalist charlatan. In attempting to raise the national consciousness of his people, he achieved his goal.

Whereas romanticism has never disappeared from Lithuanian historiography, people such as Basanavičius in their amateurish way began to replace some of the fabricated history and myth of historians like Narbut and Daukantas with factual information. For instance, he already knew about the prehistoric Baltic tribe the Aestii, but he never fully rejected the outdated Palemon myth. He studied hydronimics but his findings were erroneous. Basanavičius believed that if he based his histories on the works of Western scholars, they would consider him as progressive as any scholars of his time. Basanavičius regarded history, archeology, linguistics and related fields as servants of ethnography. As a professional historian he was woefully lacking, but as an activist preaching the virtues of knowing the history of one's nation, he served Lithuania well.

Perhaps Basanavičius's most significant contribution to Lithuanian historiography was the organization and founding of the Lithuanian Scientific Society in 1907. Daukantas and Valančius had proposed the idea of a Lithuanian scholarly society already in the early nineteenth century, but there were too few scholars with a Lithuanian identity to constitute such a group. As a student in Moscow, Basanavičius brought up the idea again. Basanavičius, the German polyglot Georg Sauerwein,⁶⁴ and Šliūpas wrote a number of articles in the *Lietuviška Ceitung* calling for the establishment of a learned society. Under the leadership of Sauerwein, the Lithuanians living in Prussia organized the Birutė society. The Birutė society was

more interested in the popularization of Lithuanian history than in scholarship. Šliūpas also organized a scholarly society for the popularization of Lithuanian history. He founded the Lithuanian Scientific Society in Baltimore in 1889. Three years after the lifting of the press ban in 1904, Basanavičius, in collaboration with some younger professionally trained historians, founded the Lithuanian Scientific Society in Vilnius. He donated his large library to the Society and also edited the Society's first Lithuanian scholarly journal *Lietuvių Tauta* [Lithuanian Nation]. Ironically, the Society maintained close relations with Polish scholars in Vilnius.

Under the scholarly influence of the Society, Basanavičius's theories about the Thracians and Phrygians became only more arcane. It seems that many of the younger generation of Lithuanian scholars understood that Basanavičius's theories were wrong, but they did not have the heart to confront the patriarch of the Lithuanian national rebirth publicly with evidence proving the errors of his outdated theories. Basanavičius gave the society his inspiration and organizational skill; in turn the society forced Basanavičius to become more careful in his historical writings. Primarily by dealing with an issue like serfdom regionally, Basanavičius was forced to eschew the broad generalizations of his earlier writing. Even so, he still had an amateurish approach to such issues as the origins of place-names. Nevertheless he started to use statistical data from estate inventories, and he referred to archival material. Presumably, by 1910, the work of the Lithuanian national rebirth had been, if not completed, then at least taken over by a younger, more professional group of intellectuals who were specialists in their fields, such as the historian Jonas Totoraitis, the linguists Kazimieras Būga and Jonas Jablonskis, and others whose standards of research surpassed their nationalist mentors. Basanavičius had to keep up with the younger scholars, but he was imperious and touchy about criticism. Based on his accomplishments in the Lithuanian national cause, Lithuanians have imparted more significance to Basanavičius's career as a scholar than he deserves. In spite of his errors, he continued to pursue his scholarly interest, but his legacy to Lithuania was as a pioneer in the Lithuanian rebirth, not as a scholar. Basanavičius personalized his histories too much to be a scholar. No doubt he was well-educated and widely read, but he was at best an amateur linguist, archeologist, historian, and

ethnolinguist, whose primary goal was the 'awakening' of the Lithuanian nation.

JONAS ŠLIŪPAS

Jonas Šliūpas provoked more controversy than most figures of the Lithuanian rebirth. He was more intellectually honest than Basanavičius but not as revered as Basanavičius. At times tactless, always changing, he was perceived as an inflammatory atheist.⁶⁵ The Polish press labeled him a "Lithomanian," a radical socialist, and a Muscovite collaborator. In his 1887 pamphlet entitled *Litwini i Polacy* [Lithuanians and Poles], Šliūpas declared that only when the "workers of the world unite," would there be a sincere brotherhood of nations.⁶⁶ Like Marx, he saw the specter of revolution haunting Europe.⁶⁷ Šliūpas, however, never called for class conflict. In spite of his early Marxist associations, he had very little to do with radical socialists.⁶⁸ He collaborated with Russian and Polish socialists,⁶⁹ for which the Russians put him in jail and prohibited him from studying in Russia. In one case, a priest accused him of going to Moscow to assassinate Tsar Alexander III; in another instance, Šliūpas wrote to his brother that "the Belarusin [Russian] rulers have done us a great deal of good."⁷⁰ Šliūpas did not see contradictions in his views or actions. Eventually he fled to Prussia, where the authorities labeled him a Slavophile and ordered him to leave.

After Prussia, Šliūpas moved to the United States where he lived for thirty-five years. He graduated from the Maryland Medical School. Although he psychologically remained a European immigrant, America and the English language may have influenced him as much as Europe. In the United States he founded at least five Lithuanian newspapers, as many learned societies, and overall he was one of the most energetic of Lithuanian-American activists. His international socialist associations did not prevent him from evolving into a staunch Lithuanian nationalist.⁷¹ Whatever he did, no one could challenge his commitment to the Lithuanian national cause and his ability to stir passions on all sides.

Šliūpas was prolific, writing about everything from politics and history, to atheism and child-rearing. He even wrote an article on Lithuanian Calvinism for the *Princeton Theological Review*.⁷² As a

historian, he was a compiler primarily interested in presenting Lithuania's past to as large an audience as possible for nationalist purposes. Although he proclaimed that "history concerned me a great deal,"⁷³ a critical analysis of Lithuania's past did not interest this amateur historian. Perhaps because of his positivism, Šliūpas saw history in didactic terms, as something that would teach Lithuanians to avoid mistakes. Though Šliūpas's social and political agenda could be inflammatory in its rhetoric, Šliūpas's historiography remained traditionally romantic, anti-Polish, and much like Daukantas, he tended to idealize Lithuania's past.

Other than some minor works as a student, Šliūpas's first work was an anthology of Lithuanian writers which he published in 1890.⁷⁴ Šliūpas selected the writers according to their ethnicity and patriotism, not according to their literary value.⁷⁵ One of the authors that Šliūpas wrote about claimed that, "our language was so beautiful that it was spoken on the estates, in the cities, in the yards between the poor, priests, boyars and rulers such as Odoacer, Riurik...Vytautas and Jogaila."⁷⁶ No matter how outlandish his explanation, Šliūpas would include almost anything, if it was favorable to the Lithuanian cause. Depending on the argument he wanted to make, Šliūpas would sometimes claim Mickiewicz as a Lithuanian, in other cases he would not. Like many of his predecessors Šliūpas was obsessed with the origins of the Lithuanians. He simply repeated Basanavičius's theories on the Phrygians and Thracians that the Lithuanians originally came from the Balkan peninsula. He often began his histories with Herodotus or with prehistory. In his *Lithuanian Ancestors in Asia Minor* he wrote that, while reading Herodotus and dwelling on the tribes of Asia Minor, he thought that the Phrygian, Lydians, Trojans and several other tribes must be related to the Thracians.⁷⁷ He continued by explaining how Heinrich Schliemann found the remnants of Lithuania's civilization in Troy.⁷⁸ He also accepted as fact the largely mythical chronology of Lithuanian rulers before Mindaugas, but Šliūpas was curiously silent about Lithuania's Roman origins as Daukantas and Narbutas had presented them. Šliūpas must have known about the Bychocvo Chronicle, but he did not repeat the Palemon myth. Šliūpas knew a variety of newer sources, and even though his nationalist agenda prohibited any dispassionate interpretations, he did not want to go backwards in

historiography by accepting the old myths of Narbutt or Daukantas. Apparently, a Roman heritage was not good enough for Šliūpas. By placing Lithuania's ancestors in Asia Minor, he could make Lithuania's ancestors even more ancient. Imagination mixed with a dilettante's knowledge of linguistics was all that Šliūpas needed.

After the introduction of *Lithuanian Ancestors in Asia Minor*, Šliūpas continues with geography, race, biology, and a good dose of imagination. Šliūpas said he wrote his histories for Lithuanian youth. Why Šliūpas included so much prehistory or history unrelated to Lithuania is difficult to say. Only in his imagination could he connect so much disparate material. In one chapter he retells the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Possibly Šliūpas wrote this book as an introduction to a world history from a Lithuanian national perspective. Certainly by today's standards, his histories are an unwieldy mixture of different areas of knowledge. Rarely did Šliūpas use footnotes, and when he does, he uses internal citations without a full explanation. Initially, he cited only five sources for this book: Basanavičius, Herodotus, Xantho, Rawlinson and Grote. Later he included citations from Kraszewski, Narbutt, Daukantas, Karamazin, Voigt, Strykowski, Kotzube, and the classics. Occasionally he refers to the chronicles of Henry the Latvian or the Prussian Chronicles of Dusburg, but it is unclear if these are secondary references or whether he had access to the original sources. Unquestionably, Šliūpas was both literate and well-informed. As a publicist and a propagandist he had his strengths but he was a poor scholar.

In another instance, Šliūpas started his histories with an introduction to racial types based on the theories of the German physiologist Johann Blumenbach (1752-1840) and the German evolutionist Ernst Haeckel (1834-1912). Much like Basanavičius, who used the latest linguistic sources but whose information was later proven wrong, Šliūpas chose pioneering anatomists and zoologists whose ideas have very little value today. Obviously, Šliūpas knew the latest scientific theories. The question, however, is why include them in a history on Lithuania?⁷⁹ One detects that Šliūpas's obsession with the prehistory of Asia minor goes beyond a search for the origins of the Lithuanians. Perhaps he was looking for the master race—the Balts.

Much like his hero Daukantas, Šliūpas was somewhat of a Balto-phile. Initially he equated Lithuanians with the Balts. He included in

his history of Lithuania the conquest of the old Prussians by the Teutonic Knights and the Polish "butchery" of the Jatvigs.⁸⁰ Unfortunately for the Lithuanians and the Latvians, nothing ever came of Baltophilism.

Šliūpas expanded the scope of Lithuanian mythology by going beyond associating the Lithuanian and the Olympian god. He linked Perkūnas, the Lithuanian god of thunder, with the Hindu god Brahma, but later connected other Lithuanian gods with Juno or Neptune. He often put a question mark after these assertions, but did not delve very deeply into the validity of such claims. A half-century earlier Narbutt had popularized some of this nonsense. By the standards of professional historians of the late nineteenth century, Šliūpas should have been more discriminating in what he used. Nevertheless, as a Lithuanian nationalist, he served his purpose. Occasionally, he admitted that the historical record was incomplete, but the details of historical research simply did not concern him. In addition to using history as a tool to raise national consciousness, Šliūpas used it to bolster his national and religious arguments with the Poles. Overall, Šliūpas could not resist making insults, but he saved his invectives for the Poles and the Church. Accepting the myth of ancient Lithuanian Druids and their literacy, Šliūpas alleged that prehistoric Lithuanian culture was on a higher plane than Polish civilization, stating that while the Poles had accepted Christianity, "The Poles still wore skins and ate raw meats."⁸¹ According to Šliūpas, the Lithuanians did not inevitably have to accept Christianity. He thought that Vytautas, not Jogaila, accepted Christianity as a countermeasure to the Teutonic crusades:

If it were not for beastly laziness and fear of foreign aggression, the Polish szlachta would not have wanted a union with Lithuania,...but they wanted to expand their borders...and they liked the murderous, weak willed, milksop Jogaila, while they feared the bold Vytautas. After all, the magnates could demand more privileges from a weakling like Jogaila.⁸²

For Šliūpas, historical truth was not always the goal. Šliūpas wrote that Vytautas accepted Christianity, but much like himself, Vytautas was religiously a freethinker.⁸³ Historians may disagree about the exact circumstances of Lithuania's christening; most however, would

agree that Christianity was inevitable, that Jogaila accepted Christianity, and that by accepting Christianity the Lithuanians progressed culturally and politically.⁸⁴ Contrary to Šliūpas's interpretations, after Lithuania's christening in 1387, the Lithuanians and the Poles eventually became cultural and political countrymen, whereas the Russians became outsiders.⁸⁵

Likewise, Šliūpas thought that the partitions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth were essentially inconsequential for the Lithuanians. After the partitions the Russians joined the Polonized szlachta in oppressing the Lithuanian peasantry.⁸⁶ Šliūpas similarly distorted the history of the 1831 and 1863 insurrections. He claimed that the Poles had difficulty getting Lithuanian recruits for the 1831 insurrection and that the peasants did not support the 1863 insurrection. According to Šliūpas, the clergy incited the peasants to revolt against the Russians.⁸⁷ Much like Basanavičius, Šliūpas continued to distance the Lithuanians from the nineteenth-century Polish insurrections. *Aušrininkai* like Šliūpas and Basanavičius understood that if the insurrections had succeeded, the Lithuanians would be in the same position as before the partitions, that is, the szlachta would be the leaders socially and economically, and politically the Lithuanians would be junior partners in a resurrected Commonwealth.

Šliūpas resented, as did most Lithuanians, the Polish notion that Lithuanians were fellow "Poles who spoke differently." Šliūpas believed in the natural rights of people who spoke one language and were of a common heritage to form a nation. Almost out of context Šliūpas wrote, "Lithuania wants to be politically independent."⁸⁸ Unlike previous statements about Lithuanian separatism from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth or cultural autonomy within Russia, this statement in 1887 may have been the first time that anyone called for Lithuanian independence in the modern sense.

In addition to his nationalist agenda, Šliūpas advocated secularism. Overall, he felt that religion and science were irreconcilable.⁸⁹ Specifically, Šliūpas believed that the fall of Lithuania began with "that hated cross."⁹⁰ Much of the Lithuanian nationalist clergy had problems writing about Polonization and Christianity. Many in the church presented Christianity and Polish culture as one and the same. The peasantry or the very pious might construe an attack on the use of

the Polish language in church as an affront to the Church itself.⁹¹ Unlike the Lithuanian clergy, Šliūpas had no qualms about attacking the role of the Church in Lithuanian history. Šliūpas continues by writing that the Union of Krewo only benefited the Poles because only Lithuania could save Poland from the Teutonic Knights and their brand of Catholicism.⁹² As for Jogaila's coronation as king of Poland, "it was nothing more than the simpleton Jogaila's treason"⁹³ that made him king of a backward and weak Poland. For Šliūpas, religion and the Poles were the villains in this version of history. He relished the idea that Lithuania had achieved its greatness during its pagan era. Šliūpas believed that his own irreligiousness was more akin to paganism and that the peasantry's religious superstitions and prejudices retarded Lithuania's progress. He felt the Lithuanians should free themselves from the Polish-dominated Catholic church. Šliūpas added a consistently anticlerical tone to the original version of Lithuanian-Polish relations as presented by Daukantas. In contrast, Šliūpas portrayed the Protestants in a better light. His contention that the spread of Protestantism gave Lithuanian literature an impetus may have some validity. Šliūpas's real enemy seems to have been the monolithic power of the clergy over rural Lithuania rather than the theological precepts of the Church.

Šliūpas wrote a shorter and more concise history with *Lietuvystes praeite, dabartis ir ateitis* [Lithuania's Past, Present and Future]. Less detailed and more polemical in tone, this work presented more contemporary theories as to the origins of the Lithuanians. Šliūpas knew, what for him must have been, the latest information. Many European linguists maintained that Lithuanian was similar to Sanskrit making the Lithuanian language the most archaic of Indo-European languages.⁹⁴ But then Šliūpas returned to his fixation with Lithuania's Christening:

The Lithuanian dukes and magnates accepted Christianity and became hung up on pride and drunkenness and used the Christian churches to introduce social slavery and serfdom. Christianity went hand-in-hand with chains and oppression. The Poles and the Catholics used this type of politics with pride and brought Lithuania to the Union of Lublin in 1569. It was the Lithuanian dynasty that made Poland famous throughout Europe.⁹⁵

He then proceeded to co-opt Mickiewicz as a Lithuanian who wrote in Polish, while others he considers of Lithuanian descent. He goes on to state that even the heroic Lithuanian Kościuszko could not save "the licentious and blackened republic."⁹⁶

In addition to taking a traditional chronological and romantic approach to Lithuania's history, he included cultural history. He wanted more than the myths and legends of the chroniclers.⁹⁷ Although hardly applying modern methods, he attempted a sociological approach to history which in essence was based on folklore, customs, proverbs, and mythology. He called on historians to

...pave the way for the real history of the Lithuanian people. Show the trials and tribulations of Lithuania, show its culture, its cultural contributions and influences, show the economic situation, because then the reader can compare his own situation with that of the past and he can use that comparison for his betterment.... After all, the Middle Ages have long since past. We live today in an era of economic unrest, which is why we wait for you to research the past and show us how people in the past helped one another.⁹⁸

When dealing with eighteenth- and nineteenth-century history, Šliūpas wrote that the Lithuanian national revival helped Lithuanians socially. Nevertheless, Šliūpas does not seem as concerned with the social question as much as with the national question.

Living in America, he wrote to Basanavičius about his intentions and problems in writing a history of Lithuania:

With or without the necessary objectivity, I do not want to lose the notion of writing a history of the Lithuanian nation.... I am not so much interested in a political history as much as an exposition of our spirit and our nation's culture...every step of the way I lack sources.⁹⁹

Šliūpas knew what he was doing, why, and how to do it. For all of his naiveté, lack of sources, and originality, he was aware of his own shortcomings. He was more honest and realistic about himself than the sometimes pretentious Basanavičius. Šliūpas wrote about his three-volume *Lietuvių Tauta Senovėje ir Šiadien* [The Lithuanian Nation in the Past and the Present] in a letter to Basanavičius, where

he confesses that his book does not differ a great deal from Narbutt's or Daukantas's works.¹⁰⁰ In a candid admission he wrote, "I am a dilettante in our history, I usually collect the works of others rather than write something original."¹⁰¹ Šliūpas understood that the historian should not merely rewrite what others have already written. During a speech delivered at his seventy-fifth birthday party Šliūpas said, "I was not interested in originality, only in propaganda—I always thought I was an agitator for a better future for the Lithuanian nation." Perhaps the only original contribution to Lithuanian historiography was Šliūpas's introduction of the works of the Ukrainian historian Volodymyr Antonovych (1834-1908) into Lithuanian history. Antonovych wrote one of the first scientifically sound histories of Lithuania entitled *Ocherk istorii Velikogo Kniazhestva Litovskogo* [Outline of the History of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania] in 1878. As a Ukrainian, his anti-Polish views were sufficiently compatible for use in Šliūpas's histories.

Ultimately Šliūpas was a reasonable person who often changed his interpretations with new evidence. He would also make pronouncements based on his targeted audience or what he believed to be in the best interest of Lithuanians. Over a period of time he would contradict himself. For instance, what was Šliūpas's attitude toward the Russians? For the Poles, one of the most damning pieces of evidence against Šliūpas was his 1882 petition to the minister of the interior for the restoration of the Latin alphabet. In it he writes about the use of the "grazhdanka" Cyrillic alphabet. He says,

...pushing the alphabet by force on us distances us from a moral-spiritual union with the Russians and fosters our closeness with the Poles. The Polish clergy and boyars in a masterful way exploit the press ban...for the Lithuanian party to gain a counterweight against the Poles, we need the Latin alphabet.... From one side the government will gain good citizens, Lithuanian loyalty and gratitude, and will arm us against clandestine insurrection...and will not leave us in the sway of Polish culture.... For Russia's and the Lithuanian's benefit, the Polish language has to be changed to the Lithuanian and Russian languages in the Sejny, Vilnius, and Kaunas seminaries.¹⁰²

While this letter says nothing about Lithuanian historiography, it speaks volumes about Šliūpas and the Polish accusations that the Lithuanians were Russian pawns. For tactical reasons the Lithuanians would occasionally play one side against the other, but the fact is that neither Šliūpas nor any of the *Aušrininkai* were so Machiavellian or consistent as to pursue a concerted policy toward the Poles or the Russians. Temperamentally Šliūpas was too unpredictable to be anyone's pawn. In other words, in 1882 he could sound obsequious to the Russians while in 1891 he co-authored an English-language brochure¹⁰³ with a priest, Aleksandras Burba,¹⁰⁴ filled with Marxist jargon.

In 1884, consistent with his shifting nature, Šliūpas began editing the newspaper *Unija* in New York, which ostensibly came to symbolize a compromise between the Poles and Lithuanians. The American Poles and the Lithuanians even signed an agreement about its publication. For some reason, however, the Poles walked out of the venture before the first issue appeared. Šliūpas then argued with his Lithuanian co-editor over the establishment of independent Lithuanian parishes, after which his co-editor fired Šliūpas. In other words, the atheist concerned himself with the fate of Roman Catholic parishes. Soon after Šliūpas left, *Unija* closed. Without Šliūpas, publications often no longer attracted readers.

In his *Auszra* days Šliūpas engaged in a debate with the Polish newspaper *Dziennik Poznański*. In two open letters to the editors of *Dziennik Poznański*, Šliūpas tried to reconcile with the Poles by explaining the Lithuanian movement to them. Of course, Šliūpas's reconciliation was hardly genuine. Although the letters are not combative in tone, they state the Lithuanian position sharply. While he writes about Lithuanian-Polish brotherhood, he also states, "The Lithuanians are not separatists. The Poles are to blame for creating this idea and then sticking us with it...we are not to blame if in the future we will be forced to fight with the Poles."¹⁰⁵

As often happens, Šliūpas's letters give more insight into his world than his histories. In a series of letters to his brother Stanislovas, Jonas Šliūpas encourages his brother to enlighten himself by reading the works of Comte, Darwin, Spencer, John Stuart Mill, the English historian Henry Thomas Buckle, and the French historian

Jean Poujoulat.¹⁰⁶ Some historians believe John Draper's *History of the Intellectual Development of Europe* and *History of the Conflict Between Religion and Science* had the greatest impact on Šliūpas.¹⁰⁷ He writes to his brother about stages in history and about science's victory over ignorance. Šliūpas could alternately be practical and philosophical in his beliefs. "History gives boldness to face life, moves the nation's forces, inspires faith in the future, moves our ideals to greater self-reliance to resist foreign domination and rule."¹⁰⁸ He theorizes about art, psychology, and science. "Our people do not need Latin, we need mathematics and science a thousand times more than anything else...science allows us to understand the nature of man and the laws that govern him."¹⁰⁹ Although Šliūpas occasionally made philosophical pronouncements, he never created a philosophy of history. Some of his statements seem profound but they are usually not elaborated. Because much of Western erudition came through a Polish prism, the Lithuanian version of ideas, such as socialism, materialism, and positivism, were pale reflections of the original ideas.

Polish positivism¹¹⁰ influenced Šliūpas a great deal. Throughout his letters and diaries he cites the leading Polish positivist Aleksander Œwiętochowski. More so than many of the *Aušrininkai*, Šliūpas refers to the Polish positivist newspapers *Prawda*, *Głos*, *Przegląd Tygodniowy* and *Kraj*. Only after *Auszra*'s demise would Lithuanians clarify how positivism would apply to the Lithuanian situation. As usual with Šliūpas, he would change with time or simply contradict himself. Incongruously, Šliūpas could idealize Lithuania's history yet retain a certain realism about Lithuania's past. Often he would blame Lithuania's downfall on internal factors rather than foreign influences. Only in some aspects, like calling for economic histories and favoring prose over poetry, was he consistent with positivism.

Šliūpas's most important contribution to Lithuanian historiography was his three-volume history of Lithuania. Until the appearance of the *History of the Lithuanian SSR*, it remained the longest history of Lithuania written in the Lithuanian language. *Lietuvių Tauta Senovėje ir Šiadien* [The Lithuanian Nation in the Past and Today] was by Šliūpas's own admission a compilation of previously written histories. Nevertheless, it furthered Daukantas's interpretation of

Lithuania's history by extending Lithuania's history past the Union of Lublin.

For all of Šliūpas's seemingly contradictory statements and his outrageous rhetoric, he was, in fact, a reasonable individual interested in science and education. He wrote several autobiographies in which he earnestly reflected on his life.¹¹¹ He seems to have purposely made some of his writings provocative to promote either controversy or interest. Šliūpas was popular as a publicist, but as a scholar he was too detailed and arcane in his writing style to be well received. Most of the activists of the Lithuanian rebirth, like Šliūpas, paid lip service to the peasantry, but in fact his reading audience was the intelligentsia. The intelligentsia needed something other than the rewriting of Daukantas's views. In addition, his religious views often determined his reading audience. Throughout his life he socialized with priests, who were not afraid to associate with him, and unlike many he did not fear the clergy. Although he remained a dilettante, with time and maturity his historical writing became more scholarly. As for his Polonophobia, he did not care what Poles thought of him. The days were over when the two people would search for a common ground.

OTHER AUŠRININKAI

Of the more than seventy contributing authors of *Auszra*, virtually every writer dealt with history to some degree.¹¹² They were more often poets or publicists who mixed history, linguistics, and ethnology in their works rather than research-oriented scholars. The *Aušrininkai* would more often contribute works of historical fiction or translations of Polish historians. History provided a source for their literary endeavors and specifically the Middle Ages, and the tales of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania supplied much of the material for their poetry. Because the *Auszra* activists believed that Lithuania's history had not ended, they linked the past, the present, and future. Sometimes intentionally but more often out of sincere belief, they idealized and exaggerated Lithuania's past.

Another *Aušrininkas* who contributed to the popularization and idealization of Lithuanian history was Vincas Pietaris (1850-1902). Pietaris received degrees in physics-mathematics and medicine from Moscow University. He spent most of his life as a medical officer in

Russia. The first Lithuanian historical novel *Algimantas* remains Pietaris's legacy. Partially influenced by and reacting to Sienkiewicz's portrayal of the Lithuanians in *The Deluge*, Pietaris depicted the Lithuanians in the most glowing terms. As a novelist, Pietaris did not try to be even-handed. In the introduction to *Algimantas* he wrote,

Our grand-forefathers left almost no information about our past. There is some type of Lithuanian Chronicle written during Vytautas's time, but the Poles, Russians and Germans say it is worthless... Today, however, we rely on foreign historians and these historians perpetrate their lies as the "holy truth."¹¹³

In *Algimantas*, Pietaris blames the Russians for all of Lithuania's ills, whereas in his play *Kova ties Žalgirio* [The Battle of Grunwald], the Poles and Jogaila are lying cowardly villains. For Pietaris history was a weapon against the Slavs. He believed that the Lithuanians had come to the shores of the Baltic from India by way of the Balkans, the Apennines, and the Pyrenees. They inhabited the Baltic earlier than any other peoples. Pietaris did not have to explain or justify his views. He could simply state his view that the Lithuanians were superior to the Russians and the Poles.¹¹⁴ He interpreted history by fiat. The artist could interpret history without the burden of proof. In his correspondence with another *Aušrininkas*, Aleksandras Dambrauskas-Jakštas, Pietaris reveals his knowledge of medieval chronicles and his positivism. Still, Pietaris's main contribution to the Lithuanian national rebirth was in the field of literature.

Another popularizer of Lithuanian history was the engineer and industrialist Petras Vileišis (1851-1926). Even before *Ausra's* appearance, Vileišis edited an underground newsletter *Kalvis Melagis* [Blacksmith the Liar, 1875-76] in St. Petersburg. As harsh as the press ban seemed, it was never absolute. The Russian censors gave Vileišis permission to publish several educational brochures. According to Basanavičius, Vileišis was the first person to popularize secular Lithuanian literature.¹¹⁵ He wrote many educational pamphlets on topics ranging from physics to hygiene to history. Often these works were edited translations. Though Vileišis was not one of *Ausra's* founders, he soon became a contributor and patron of *Ausra*. Because of his personal wealth and connections with the Russian railroad

authorities, he could smuggle Lithuanian literature from Prussia into Lithuania on a larger scale than the peasant book-smugglers with their backpacks. Not exactly a robber baron, Vileišis made fortunes and then devoted them to his Lithuanian cultural activities. He financially supported a number of Lithuanian students in St. Petersburg, and he contributed financially to many of the illegal newspapers that succeeded *Auszra*. Eventually, Vileišis became the editor of the first legal Lithuanian newspaper in the Russian empire, *Vilniaus Žinios* [Vilnius News 1904]. He personally covered the newspaper's losses, and he paid the fines the newspaper incurred for criticizing the Russian government.

As Šliūpas's personal friend, he tried to moderate Šliūpas's anti-tsarist rhetoric. Vileišis argued with but never denounced Šliūpas. As for Vileišis's literary output, much like himself, his writings were practical. His articles in *Auszra* were more often about building cabins or repairing roads. In one of his few excursions into history, he published a translation in *Auszra* of a Russian "Chronology of Kaunas," from 1025 to 1859. As a writer of history he was primarily a translator of Polish authors such as Adam Kirkor (1818-1886), Kraszewski, and Konstancya Skirmuntt. Skirmuntt's histories were essentially high-school-level textbooks, and although Skirmuntt was very sympathetic to the Lithuanian national cause, Vileišis edited passages because he disagreed with the original. Perhaps because of his pedagogic interests, he wrote and translated several books that dealt with general European and world history. Vileišis was one of the first Lithuanians to go beyond the ghetto of Lithuanian history.

* * *

There were a host of other writers whose work did not have lasting literary or historical value. They were Lithuanian patriots but insignificant as authors or thinkers. Writers such as Aleksandras Fromas-Gužutis (1822-1900) were exceptionally productive, but his works would be difficult to categorize. Some of his works were not quite essays, dramas, or historical novels. They were often a mixture of a variety of genres. Many of these *Aušrininkai* have significance

only as historical sources. They give insight into the varied world of Lithuanian historicism.

The *Aušrininkai* wanted to create a Lithuanian historical consciousness, which means that their research was secondary to their national agenda. In spite of a few Moscow University graduates who contributed to *Auszra*, most did not have the erudition and access to contemporary archeological or linguistic literature that Basanavičius or Šliūpas had. As has been shown before, even if they had better sources, much of the pioneering literature that someone such as Basanavičius relied upon did not help him unravel the origins of the Lithuanians.

The primary goal of the *Aušrininkai* was the "awakening" of a Lithuanian nation. The best way to awaken the nation spiritually was through journalism. Political action was virtually impossible. Young men with a peasant background needed a practical education. While medicine, the sciences, and the priesthood provided such an education, history did not. Unfortunately, their professions did not usually provide a vehicle for expressing their national feelings. The illegal press furnished a platform for the national sentiments of an intelligentsia that had just emerged from the village. In newspapers such as *Auszra*, journalism and national feelings merged. *Auszra* reflected the awakening of a new national consciousness and the self-perception of the Lithuanian intelligentsia. The world view that *Auszra* manifested was neither monolithic nor consistent. The socialist Šliūpas and the capitalist Vileišis did not merely coexist in *Auszra*. Their ideas complemented each other.

Why *Auszra* appeared when it did is also a problem. In reporting about European national liberation movements, Šliūpas gives a reason for the appearance of *Auszra*. According to him, Lithuanians were participating in a widespread European movement of oppressed peoples.

That we became mature and published the newspaper...the spirit of the nineteenth century influenced us. After a long war the Greeks freed themselves from the Turks in 1829, Belgium seceded from Holland in 1830. The apostle of nations in slavery, Mazzini, by words and writing achieved results. The creation of Young Hungary, Young Poland, Young Italy, Young Europe helped. The Czech's Josef Jugmann, František Palacký and Pavel

Šafařík raised the heads of the Czech nation. In Ireland Charles Parnell and Daniel O'Connell worked. After the Russian-Turkish war Serbia, Bulgaria, Romania and the Balkans became free. So freedom for small nations was in the air.¹¹⁶

"In the air," does not explain anything. Yet, the phrase sums up a multitude of cultural, political, and economic factors that led to the Lithuanian national rebirth. The Lithuanians were Europeans who experienced the same intellectual and political trends as anywhere else on the continent. To be sure, Lithuania's development had been retarded. A Polish screen usually filtered Western-European cultural influences. A peasant nation without a university and under a press ban did not have good prospects for nation-building. Still, the works of German thinkers like Ernst M. Arndt, Hegel, and Schelling trickled down and influenced the *Aušrininkai*. Having learned about the concept of a national spirit from the Germans, the Lithuanians applied it to their own world. The activists of the Lithuanian national rebirth found the nation's spirit in culture, ethnology, and social history more often than in political or military history.¹¹⁷

Although Europeans, the *Aušrininkai* resented having to live in a Polish elite culture. The reader must not assume that the Lithuanian national consciousness developed solely as a response to Polonization. Nevertheless, Russification was more of an institutional phenomena that eventually failed. Polonism on the other hand pierced the very core of the Lithuanian national identity. Basanavičius could contemptuously exclude someone like Kraszewski from the Lithuanian nation, calling him "some type of hybrid Lithuanian-Pole," but many of the *Aušrininkai* still had no clear idea what Lithuanians were or what Lithuania would be. They retained cultural, religious, and historic ties with the Poles. Yet, the Lithuanians felt that Lithuania had a separate future, whereas those of Polish culture felt that Lithuania's destiny lie with Poland. Some individuals wanted to maintain the notion of citizenship in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania without reference to language or ethnicity. *Auszra* made this idea virtually impossible. If 1789 symbolizes the start of contemporary French history, then 1883, with the appearance of *Auszra*, symbolizes the start of contemporary Lithuanian history. Socioeconomic factors may have played a more decisive role in the creation of a nation's consciousness, but *Auszra* reflected that consciousness.

NOTES

1. Alfred Eric Senn, *Jonas Basanavičius: The Patriarch of the Lithuanian National Renaissance* (Newtonville: Oriental Research Partners, 1980), 11.
2. Anyone associated with *Auszra*. The modern Lithuanian spelling is *Aušra*.
3. Basanavičius, "Priekalba" [Introduction], *Auszra*, 1 March 1883, 3-7.
4. Anthony Smith writes about the "naturalization" of landmarks such as Stonehenge, where a historical monument of a particular time and context becomes part of the national identity. *National Identity*, 66.
5. Thaden, *Russia's Western Borderlands, 1710-1870*, 123.
6. K. Kaufman, "Letter to the minister of the interior 6 August 1865," in Juozas Žiugžda et al., eds., *Lietuvos TSR Istorijos Šaltiniai* [Lithuanian SSR History Sources], vol. 2., 127.
7. Vincas Maciūnas in his *Lituanistinis Sąjūdis XIX* emphasizes the role of the Samogitia in the Lithuanian national rebirth. David Fainhauz gives America an important place in the Lithuanian national rebirth. See Fainhauz, *Lithuanians in the USA: Aspects of Ethnic Identity* (Chicago: Lithuanian Library Press, 1991). Miroslav Hroch places the beginning of the Lithuanian national rebirth in the Suwałki province in the Congress Kingdom of Poland. See Hroch, *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe*. Still others place the start of the national rebirth in the Russian universities or in Lithuania Minor.
8. Chlebowczyk, *On Small and Young Nations in Europe*, 121.
9. Edvardas Vidmantas, "Aušros Įkūrimas, Jos Programa ir Reikšmė" [The Establishment of Aušra: Its Program and Importance], *Lietuvos Istorijos Metraštis* (Vilnius: Mokslas, 1983), 37.
10. Jonas Šliūpas, "Simanas Daukantas," *Auszra*, 1 March 1883, 43.
11. Šliūpas, "Lietuvos bicziulis" [Lithuania's friend], *Auszra*, 3 May 1883, 76.
12. Rimantas Vėbra, *Lietuvių Tautinis Atgimimas XIX Amžiuje* [The Lithuanian National Rebirth in the 19th century] (Kaunas: Šviesa, 1992), 113.
13. Konrad Górski, *Divide et Impera* (Białystok: Towarzystwo Literackie im. Adama Mickiewicza Oddział Białostocki, 1995), 169.
14. Jonas Basanavičius [pseud. Birštonas], "'Auszra' ir 'Dziennik Poznański,'" *Auszra*, 7 September 1883, 186.
15. *Ibid.*, 189.
16. Piotr Łossowski, "Gazeta 'Auszra' i początek narodowego ruchu litewskiego (1883-1886)," in *Studia z dziejów ZSRR i Europy Środkowej*, 120.
17. In 1902 Aleksandras Dambrauskas wrote a pamphlet entitled *Głos litwinów do młodej generacji magnatów, obywateli i szlachty na Litwie* [A Lithuanian Voice Addressed to the Young Generation of Magnates, Land-owners and Szlachta in Lithuania] in which he called on the Polonized upper classes to join the Lithuanian national movement. Aleksander Meysztowicz answered the pamphlet with his own brochure entitled *Przenigdy* [Never]. The Lithuanians started this argument because they felt that maintaining the status quo meant further Polonization. The Poles soon responded to attacks with their own rhetoric. Although the Poles of the Congress Kingdom participated in these arguments, most of the venom between the two groups was actually between ethnic Lithuanians and Poles living in what used to be the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.
18. Ochmański, *Litewski ruch*, 183.

19. Mykolas Biržiška, *Lietuvių Tautos Kelias* [The Lithuanian Nations Path], vol. 2 (Los Angeles: Lietuvių Dienos, 1953), 24. Mykolas Biržiška (1882-1962) was one of the most prolific historians of Lithuanian literature and culture. He signed the Lithuanian declaration of independence, served as a cabinet minister, and was the rector of the University of Kaunas.

20. Römer, *Litwa*, 177.

21. "Swetur" [Foreign affairs], *Auszra*, 3 May 1883, 85.

22. Stanislovas Raila, "Į darbą kas lietuvis!" [To work! For Those Who are Lithuanian], *Auszra*, 6 August 1883, 157.

23. The Lithuania national identity of the *Auszra* epoch best fits Anthony D. Smith's model of an "ethnic community." See *National Identity*, 21.

24. Aukštaičiai refers to the highlanders of Lithuania, while the Samogitians (Žemaičiai) refers to the lowlanders. Aukštaitija and Žemaitija also refer to the eastern and western parts of Lithuania. In the archaic usage of the Samogitians, Aukštaitija and Lithuania were considered synonyms. Aukštaitija includes the Vilnius region.

25. To this day the concept of Polonization remains debatable. Many Lithuanians still hold that very few immigrants from Poland ever settled in Lithuania. See Halina Turska, *O powstaniu polskich obszarów językowych na Wileńszczyźnie* [About the Start of the Spread of the Polish Language in the Vilnius Region] (1939, reprint, Vilnius: Mintis, 1995).

26. Jonas Dainauskas, "Auszros Gadynė" [Auszra's epoch], epilogue to reprint of *Auszra* (Chicago: Lithuanian Historical Society, 1983), 685.

27. Edvardas Vidmantas, "Martyno Jankaus Vaidmuo Leidžiant 'Aušrą,'" [Martynas Jankus's Role in Publishing "Aušrą"] *Knygotyra*, 22, no. 29 (Vilnius: Vilniaus Universiteto Leidykla): 28-33.

28. Domas Kaunas, *Aušrininkas: Tautinio atgimimo spaudos kūrėjas Jurgis Mikšas* [Aušrininkas: A Creator the National Rebirth's Press Jurgis Mikšas] (Vilnius: Kultūra, 1996). Kaunas maintains that Mikšas was as important an *Aušrininkas* as Basanavičius or Šliūpas.

29. Jonas Basanavičius, "Isz 'Auszros' gyvenimo" [From Auszra's Life], *Vienybė Lietuvininku* (Plymouth Pa.), 51, January 1903, 606-607.

30. Vytautas Bagdonavičius, "Lietuviška materialistinė raštija iki nepriklausomybės paskelbimo" [Lithuanian Materialist Writing up to the Proclamation of Independence], in *Lietuvių katalikų mokslų akademijos metraštis* (Rome: Lietuvių katalikų mokslų akademijos, 1966), 145.

31. Richard Waswo, *The Founding Legend of Western Civilization: From Virgil to Vietnam* (Hanover: Wesleyan University Press, 1997).

32. Ernest Renan, "Qu'est-ce qu'une nation?" in *Becoming National: A Reader*, eds. Geoff Eley and Ronald Grigor Suny (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 15.

33. Anthony D. Smith, "Introduction," in *Nationalist Movements*, ed. Anthony D. Smith (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976), 8.

34. Smith, *National Identity*, 161.

35. Mikołaj Akielewicz, quoted in Kajetonas Čeginskas, "Lietuvių tautos atgimimo pradmenys" [The Beginnings of the Lithuanian Nation's Rebirth], in *Kovos Metai dėl savosios spaudos* [The Years of Struggle for Our Own Press], Vytautas Bagdonavičius et al., eds. (Chicago: Lithuanian Community of the Chicago Area, 1957), 100.

36. When Lithuania became independent in 1918, Basanavičius refused to leave Polish Vilnius claiming it was Lithuania's rightful capital city.

37. Juozas Jurginis, "Jono Basanavičiaus Kultūrinis Palikimas" [J. Basanavičius's Cultural Legacy] in Jonas Basanavičius, *Rinkiniai Raštai* [Selected Writings] (Vilnius: Vaga, 1970), III.

38. Basanavičius "Jonas Basanavyczius," in Jonas Šliūpas [Lietuvos Mylėtojas, pseud.], *Lietuvizkiejie Rasztai ir Rasztininkai* [Lithuanian Writings and Writers] (Tilsit: Baltimore M.D.L.M. Daugystės, 1890), 193.

39. Bronius Untulis, "D-ro Jono Basanavičiaus teorija apie lietuvių tautos kilmę" [Dr. Jonas Basanavičius's Theory about the Lithuanian Nation's Ancestry], *Lietuvių Tauta*, 4 (Vilnius: 1927): 243.

40. *Thrakische Elemente im Bulgarischen; Ueber die Bestimmung trojanischer Terra-Cotta-Wirtel; Ueber die Verbreitung des asianischen Syllabaium*, and in Lithuanian he published *Lietuviškai-trakiškos studijos* [Lithuanian-Thracian Studies], 1898; *Levas lietuvių pasakose ir prygiškai trakiškoje daileje* [The Lion in Lithuanian Tales and Thraco-Phrygian Art]; *Apie trakų prygų tautysė ir jų atsikėlimas Lietuvon* [On the Nationality of the Thraco Phrygians and their Migration to Lithuania]; *Trakų kalbos likučiai vietų varduose lietuvių kalbos šviesoje* [Thracian Linguistic Remains in Toponyms in the Light of the Lithuanian Language].

41. Jurginis, in Jonas Basanavičius, *Rinkiniai Raštai*, V.

42. Jaroszewicz, *Obraz Litwy*, vol. 1, 66.

43. Simas Sužiedėlis and Antanas Kučas, eds., *Encyclopedia Lituanica* (Boston: Kapočius, 1976), s.v. "Tetzner," by Antanas Mažulis.

44. August Schleicher, *Handbuch der litauischen Sprache*, vol. 2, VII, quoted in Basanavičius, *Lietuvių Kryžiai Archeologijos Šviesoje* [Lithuanian Crosses in the Light of Archeology], in *Rinkiniai Raštai*, 125.

45. Jonas Basanaviczzius, *Lietuvizskai Trakiszkos Studijos* [Lithuanian Thracian Studies] (Shenandoah, Pa.: Dirva, 1898), 44.

46. Anthony Smith believes that nationalism needs monuments that have a special meaning for the ethnic group. See *National Identity*, 66.

47. Basanavičius, *Apie Senovės Lietuvos Pilis*, in *Rinkiniai Raštai*, 98.

48. *Czas, Gazeta Narodowa, Dziennik Poznański, Przegląd Katolicki* responded to *Auszra* and Basanavičius's anti-Polish attacks.

49. Petras Vileišis, "Prakalba" [Introduction], in Jonas Basanavičius, *Lenkai Lietuvoje* [The Poles in Lithuania], trans. from Russian by V. Gintautas [Petras Vileišis] (Chicago: Lietuvos, 1903), 5.

50. Basanaviczzius, *Lietuvizskai Trakiszkos Studijos*, 122.

51. Basanavičius, *Lenkai Lietuvoje* (Chicago: Lietuvos, 1903. iš Rusiško išguldė V. Gintautas), 24.

52. Owen Chadwick, *The Secularization of the European Mind in the 19th Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 189-228.

53. Basanavičius, *Iš Krikščionijos Santykių su Senovės Lietuvių Tikyba ir Kultūra* [From Christian Relations with Ancient Lithuania's Religion and Culture] (Vilnius: Kuktos, 1912), 8.

54. Basanavičius, *Apie senovės Lietuvos pilis*, in *Rinkiniai Raštai*, 100.

55. *Ibid.*

56. Basanavičius, "Baudžiava Lietuvoje" [Serfdom in Lithuania], *Lietuvių Tauta* (Vilnius: Kuktos, 1907), 95.

57. *Ibid.*, III.

58. *Ibid.* Evidently Basanavičius took a variation of a common Polish saying, but he omitted that it was a purgatory for the burghers. Norman Davies, *God's Playground: A History of Poland*, vol. 1 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982), 207.

59. The issue of Lithuanian anti-Semitism as a component in the Lithuanian national movement has not been fully analyzed. Nevertheless, many of the Lithuanian activists made anti-Semitic pronouncements.

60. Egidijus Motieka, "Jonas Basanavičius: Tarp Tradicinio ir Modernaus Valstybingumo" [Jonas Basanavičius: Between Traditional and Modern Statehood], in Egidijus Motieka et al., eds., *Asmuo: tarp tautos ir valstybės*, vol. 8, *Lietuvių Atgimimo Istorijos Studijos*, 241.

61. Basanavičius, *Lenkai Lietuvoje*, 34.

62. *Ibid.*, 35.

63. *Ibid.*

64. Allegedly Sauerwein (1831-1904) knew forty-three languages. Although he was a German, he so closely associated himself with the Lithuanians of Lithuania Minor and the Lithuanian national rebirth that for a while he reinvented himself as a Lithuanian. He is the author of the Lithuania Minor anthem, "Lietuviai esame mes Gimę" [Lithuanians We are Born]. After losing two elections to the German Reichstag as the Lithuanian minority representative, he became disenchanted with the Lithuanians, left Tilsit, and died in Norway.

65. Many believe Šliūpas was a freethinker rather than an atheist. He associated with some priests, and he felt that Lithuanians should have their own parishes in America.

66. Jan Szlupus, *Litwini i Polacy* (New York: Lietuwiszkasis Balsas, 1887), 37.

67. *Ibid.*, 28.

68. Ochmański, *Litewski ruch*, 46.

69. He had dealings with the leading Polish socialist Bolesław Limanowski.

70. Šliūpas, "Letter to Stanislovas Šliūpas, 1 February 1882, Moscow," quoted in Vytautas Merkys, *Nelegalioji Lietuvių Spauda Kapitalizmo Laikotarpiu (ligi 1904)* [The Illegal Lithuanian Press in the Period of Capitalism to 1904] (Vilnius: Mokslas, 1978), 154.

71. Later in life he became a professor at Kaunas University, and he even became the mayor of the seaside resort of Palanga.

72. John Szlupus, "Lithuania and its Ancient Calvinistic Churches," *Princeton Theological Review*, 5, no. 4 (April 1907): 242-280.

73. Jonas Šliūpas, *Ispazintis* [Confession], quoted in Juozas Jakštas, *Dr. Jonas Šliūpas* (Chicago: Akademinės Skautijos Leidykla, 1979), 182.

74. Šliūpas [pseud. Lietuvos Mylėtojas], *Lietuvizkiejie Rasztai ir Rasztininkai*.

75. Jakštas, *Šliūpas*, 115.

76. Šliūpas, *Lietuvizkiejie Rasztai ir Rasztininkai*, 85.

77. Jonas Šliūpas, *Lietuvių Pratėviai Mažajoje Azijoje: Nuo senovės iki jie pateko po valdžia Persu* [Lithuanian Ancestors in Asia Minor: From the Oldest Times to the Time They Came under the Rule of the Persians] (Chicago: Lietuvos, 1899), 5.

78. *Ibid.*

79. Even in an American newspaper like *Unija*, which presumably would be intended to help immigrants assimilate to life in America, Šliūpas wrote extensively on his and Basanavičius's theories about the origins of the Lithuanians.

80. Šliūpas, *Lietuvių Pratėviai Mažajoje Azijoje*, 6.

81. Šliūpas, *Lietuvių Tauta Senovėje ir Šiadien*, 389.
82. *Ibid.*, vol. 2, 242.
83. Szlupas, *Litwini i Polacy*, 12.
84. Jakštas, *Šliūpas*, 103.
85. *Ibid.*, 104.
86. Szlupas, *Litwini i Polacy*, 29.
87. *Ibid.*, 18.
88. *Ibid.*, 5.
89. G. Pranckietytė, "Jono Šliūpo Materialistinės Idėjos" [Šliūpas's Materialism], in R. Plečkaitis, *Lietuvos Filosofijos Istorija* (Vilnius: Lietuvių Akademija, 1990), 148.
90. *Ibid.*, 459.
91. Peasants who only knew the Lithuanian language would, nevertheless, say their prayers in Polish. The peasants would suspect anyone arguing with the parish priest over virtually any subject.
92. Šliūpas, *Lietuvių Tauta Senovėje ir Šiadien*, 243.
93. *Ibid.*, 244.
94. Šliūpas, *Lietuvių Pratėviai Mažajoje Azijoje*, 5.
95. *Ibid.*, 7.
96. *Ibid.*, 9.
97. Šliūpas, "Gromatos iš Amerikos" [Observations from America], *Ausra*, 2/3 February – March 1885, 79.
98. Šliūpas, "Lietuvos bicziulis" [Lithuania's friend], *Ausra*, 4 June 1883, 109.
99. Šliūpas, "Letter to Basanavičius, 12 December 1900, Scranton Pa.," in *Rinktiniai Raštai* [Selected Writings] (Vilnius: Vaga, 1977), 498.
100. Šliūpas, "Letter to Basanavičius, 1 September 1904, Philadelphia," in *Ibid.*, 507.
101. *Ibid.*
102. Ivan Šliupovič, "A Petition to the Minister of the Interior of Kaunas, Šiauliai," USSR Central State History Archive 775 F. 20 ap., 1882., 522 b., 21 l. [Photocopy]. Michał Römer stated that, "It is difficult to find words strong enough to denounce him. Murav'ev the hangman's ideas are found here in every sentence." In Römer, *Litwa*, 133.
103. Aleksandras Burba and John Szlupas, *Bestiality of the Russian Czardom toward Lithuania* (Baltimore: Lithuanian Society of Sciences and Arts, 1891).
104. Born in Lithuania, Burba (1854-1898) moved to the United States to avoid political persecution. Although his writing style was not very good, he was one of the most active writers, publishers, and activists in America.
105. Jan Szlupas, "List," *Dziennik Poznański*, 53, February 25, 1884, 2. In Ochmański, *Litewski Ruch*, 185.
106. Šliūpas, "Letter to Stanislovas Šliūpas, 23 January 1882, Moscow," in *Rinktiniai Raštai*, 406.
107. Jakštas, *Šliūpas*, 41. John Draper (1811-1882) was a chemist and popularizer of intellectual history. Best sellers, his two histories were translated into eight languages including Polish. Draper believed that Catholicism was a major obstacle to the development of science. He also believed civilizations advanced according to the laws of nature.
108. Šliūpas, *Lietuvių Tauta Senovėje ir Šiadien*, vol. 1, 3.
109. *Ibid.*
110. Šliūpas never defined his positivism. He believed that science and education could cure the ills of society and that ignorance and superstition caused the peasantry's

poverty. As influential as Polish positivism was for Šliūpas, he never identified himself with a consistent philosophy. Even his socialism was muddled. See Ochmański, *Litewski ruch*, 193.

111. Possibly trying to imitate Rousseau, he wrote three autobiographies entitled *Iszpažintis* [Confession].

112. Hroch gives the social composition of the *Aušrininkai* in his *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe*, 89. The largest group was students followed by the clergy.

113. Vincas Pietaris, *Algimantas*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: Lithuanian Library Press, 1978), 6.

114. Juozas Grinius et al., eds., *Lietuvių Enciklopedija* (Boston: Kapočius, 1960), s.v. "Pietaris, Vincas," by Juozas Brazaitis.

115. Jonas Basanavičius quoted in Jonas Aničas, *Petras Vileišis 1851-1926* (Vilnius: Alna Litera, 1993), 86.

116. Šliūpas, *Jaunatvė – gyvenimo pavasaris* [Youth – lifes spring], in *Rinktiniai Raštai*, 297.

117. Bronius Genzelis, "Epochos Filosofinių Idėjų Atgarsiai 'Aušroje,'" [The Epoch's Philosophical Echoes in Auszra] in "*Aušra*" ir *lietuvių visuomeninis judėjimas XIXa. pabaigoje*, Jonas Kubilius et al., eds. (Vilnius: Mokslas, 1988), 101.

VIII

CATHOLICS AND LIBERALS

*Church is above History;
Tribes or races are under History,
And only nations are in history.*

CYPRIAN NORWID

*The knowledge of the past is desired
only for the service of the future and
the present,....*

FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE

THE CATHOLIC PRESS

Several newspapers filled the vacuum left after *Auszra* ceased publication. Although individual activists wrote an occasional pamphlet on Lithuanian history, the illegal press remained the guardian of Lithuanian history. Much like the *Auszra* era, the period between *Auszra*'s termination in 1886 and 1904 produced no professionally trained historians. Nevertheless, history permeated all of the post-*Auszra* publications. In fact, journalists dominated the study of history. This newer generation of journalists often reacted against the idealized version of Lithuania's history. Whether the journalists of the post-*Auszra* era were presenting fictionalized accounts of Lithuanian history, or whether they were debating some contemporary political issue, Lithuanian journalists used history either as a tool to foster national consciousness or as a weapon against Poles or Russians. Because it was the only Lithuanian newspaper, *Auszra* forced Lithuanians with different philosophical or political viewpoints to coexist under its roof. As the national rebirth became broader and more mature, it expanded ideologically.

Catholics began to print *Szviiesa* [Light, Tilsit, 1887-88; 1890]; Lithuania Minor continued to produce periodicals of local interest and among a host of other publications; America contributed *Wienibe Lietuwniku* [Lithuanianits Union, Plymouth, Pa., 1886-present], Jonas Šliūpas's *Lietuwiszkasis Balsas* [The Lithuanian Voice, New York and Shenandoah, Pa., 1885-1889] and his *Unija* [New York, 1884-1885]. The *Aušrininkai* continued to be in the forefront of contributors to

these various newspapers. However, none of these papers could unite or address all of the Lithuanian intelligentsia. A split began to develop between the Catholic and the secular press. Writers such as Basanavičius and Kudirka tried to appear neutral toward religion, but literate Lithuanians knew who was who.

Szvieša represented a diversification of the Lithuanian national rebirth by including a nationally conscious clergy. Since the days of Valančius, the church had been a bastion of resistance to Russification and Orthodoxy. However, because the clergy was heavily Polonized, it remained either indifferent or hostile to the Lithuanian national movement. With the liberation of the serfs in 1861 and the efforts of Bishop Valančius, the social composition of the clergy began to change. Increasingly the priests came from the peasantry.¹ The same process of "Lithuanianization" that had affected the *Aušrininkai* now affected the clergy. The clergy started to become Lithuanian in their outlook. Although the *Šviesininkai*² came from the same social and intellectual milieu as the *Aušrininkai*, the *Šviesininkai* could not tolerate *Auszra*'s secular bent, and of course they could not tolerate the likes of Šliūpas. This split within the Lithuanian national movement did not weaken the Lithuanian movement; it broadened it.

The editors of *Szvieša* had no intention of producing a clerical periodical, but unlike *Auszra* they wanted no hint of anti-clericalism either. Despite its call for unity among Lithuanians, *Szvieša* answered every attack on the Church made by Šliūpas or the secular *Aušrininkai*. It polemicized more with Šliūpas's *Lietuwiszskasis Balsas* than with the Polish press. In fact, as an illegal Lithuanian periodical, *Szvieša* did not differ substantially in its outlook from the legal Polish newspapers *Kraj* and *Przegląd Katolicki*.³ The only reason to read *Szvieša* was the Lithuanian language.

In trying to reach out to the literate peasantry, *Szvieša* lowered its intellectual level. Its language was simple, and its primary topics were the Church and farming. Its few articles on history made some tentative attempts to interpret the role of the Church in Lithuanian history. Whereas the *Aušrininkai* had reveled in the greatness of pagan Lithuania, the *Šviesininkai* proclaimed that the most important event in Lithuania's history was and will forever be its christening.⁴ The usual test of whether a person had Polish sentiments had been the

interpretation of the feud between the King of Poland Jogaila and his cousin the Grand Duke of Lithuania Vytautas. Lithuanian historiography usually portrayed Jogaila as a traitor who started the unfortunate association between Lithuania and Poland. Because he introduced what many Lithuanians felt was a Polish version of Catholicism into Lithuania, a nationalistically minded clergy had difficulty portraying Jogaila favorably. In the case of *Szvieša*, the author (Martynas Jankus?)⁵ gave Jogaila credit for the introduction of Christianity without emphasizing the Polish contributions to Lithuanian civilization. Jankus wrote,

The Poles seeing that their kingdom was weak and beset by enemies on all sides...turned their eyes to the mighty Jogaila, because they understood that union with Lithuania, which at that time was twice the size of Poland...would be a very good thing for them...and so Jogaila sent his messengers to Cracow so that they could christen his nation, and Lithuania and Poland would unite.⁶

Daukantas and later the *Aušrininkai* always emphasized the personal nature of the agreement that Jogaila signed at Krewo.⁷ Rarely do modern Lithuanians call it the Union of Krewo as Poles do. Additionally, the secular intelligentsia believed that the introduction of Christianity started the Polonization and eventual decline of Lithuania. Catholic interpretations would have to emphasize Lithuania's christening without drawing attention to the union with Poland. *Szvieša* did not articulate a clear Catholic position; that would have to wait for better writers. Nevertheless, *Szvieša* took the position that Christianity was inevitable and that it brought cultural and moral advances. Modern Lithuanian historians with a Christian Democratic bent still share this view.

Szvieša held an inconsistent position on Polish-Lithuanian relations. Sometimes the *Šviesininkai* were as anti-Polish as the *Aušrininkai*, at other times Catholic unity took precedence over Lithuanian separatism. *Szvieša* criticized those who assumed an air of superiority upon learning Polish. In an article by Danielius Jankūnas,⁸ the author condemned those who Polonize the spelling of their names and those who pretend to be something they are not. The author writes, "let us not look to our own Polonized lords or upon Poland,

but upon our own beloved Lithuania."⁹ The problem with *Szvieša* was that it added nothing new to the Lithuanian view of history. The *Aušrininkai* did not further historical scholarship a great deal either, but individuals like Basanavičius and Šliūpas added their nationalist biases to their interpretations. *Szvieša*'s bias was religious, meaning that ideologically *Szvieša* had not progressed into the area of nationalism that *Auszra* had. It did not yet present a clear Christian Lithuanian viewpoint nor did it open up the possibilities for the religiously oriented.

Szvieša continued the culture of translation. Its authors would find foreign works compatible with their own views, then they would edit and present them. A contributor to *Szvieša*, Petras Leonas [pseud. Petras Liūtas], chose to translate excerpts from Antoni Prochaska's (1852-1930) *Ostatnie lata Witolda* [The Last Years of Vytautas].¹⁰ Prochaska dealt with the issues of Vytautas' loyalty to the union with Poland and his desire to become king of Lithuania.¹¹ *Szvieša* chose to accept Prochaska's interpretation that Vytautas wanted to continue the union with Poland even though he wanted to be crowned a king. According to Prochaska, the Poles thwarted Vytautas's plans by stealing the crown which the Holy Roman Emperor had sent to Vytautas.¹² Prochaska's interpretation is open to debate, but noteworthy here is that *Szvieša* chose to use a passage from Prochaska that emphasized Vytautas's independence in spite of his desire to maintain friendly relations with Poland.

Another translated article dealt with the "good works of the priest" Stanisław Staszic.¹³ Although Lithuanians in the late nineteenth century had the habit of turning certain Poles into Lithuanians, Staszic was not a Lithuanian and *Szvieša* did not try to make him into one. A biographic sketch of Staszic might teach some moral lessons, but it had nothing to do with the Lithuanians. By including a favorable article about a Pole in a Lithuanian newspaper *Szvieša* went against the trend set by the *Aušrininkai* of defining who a Lithuanian was by excluding foreigners. In no sense were the *Šviesininkai* traitors to the Lithuanian national movement. However, solidarity among Catholics, if need be with the Poles, against the Russian Orthodox seemed to be the primary ideology of *Szvieša*.

Another Catholic publication taking a similar stance was *Žemaičių ir Lietuvos Apžvalga* [The Samogitian and Lithuanian Review, Tilsit, 1889-1896, often simply called *Apžvalga*]. *Apžvalga* hoped to act as a counterweight to the liberal publication *Varpas*. Its concerns were even more religious than *Szvieša's*. It accentuated their legitimacy as good Catholics by stressing that loyalty to the Pope separated the Orthodox from the Catholics. *Apžvalga* dealt with the history of the Uniates, but for a Lithuanian publication these concerns with religious matters seem out of place in a period of nationalism. Much of *Apžvalga's* historiography dealt with supernatural events or the history of some shrine. *Apžvalga* called for the collecting of folklore, but the clergy based their interest in national ethnology more on a concern with having the peasants tell "proper" stories and sing 'proper' songs rather than in finding one's roots in pagan mythology. The newspaper never attempted to revise the issue of Lithuania's christening. Simply put, Catholicism was the best thing that ever happened to Lithuania. When *Apžvalga* published articles about national figures like Daukantas, the articles seemed banal in comparison to the ones found in *Auszra* or *Varpas*. At best, *Apžvalga* reported a simplified version of international news. For much of the peasantry the illegal press was the only contact with the outside world. In this respect, *Apžvalga* fulfilled its goal to enlighten the peasantry with a Catholic worldview in Lithuanian.

Apžvalga took an equivocal position regarding the national issue. Instead of taking an overtly anti-Polish stance, it called the Polonized Lithuanian szlachta "unenlightened foreigners,"¹⁴ who look down on the peasant as a "muzhik." One might consider this approach as rooted in class antagonism, but socially *Apžvalga* was very conservative. It did not call for social change or revolution. It considered the Tsarist government as legitimately ordained.¹⁵ Only in so far as the Tsar was Orthodox was its loyalty to him tentative.

Over the course of the nineteenth century, Lithuanian attitudes toward the Poles changed. Daukantas had disparaged the "koroniaz" as Lithuania's enemies, whereas by the late nineteenth century, the activists of the Lithuanian national rebirth saw the "koroniaz" as harmless foreigners disinterested in Lithuania. The real enemy of the Lithuanians was their own Polonized szlachta. In an article by Kazimieras Pakalniškis (1866-1933), Pakalniškis writes that the

Lithuanian boyars should stop dreaming about the "white eagle flying over Lithuania because the climate has changed here...they should instead think about the two headed eagle sinking its talons into our backs."¹⁶

Often the Catholic press seemed more concerned with maintaining its leadership of the Lithuanian peasantry than with arguing with Poles or Russians. The clergy was jealous of the attention that *Auszra* and *Varpas* received. The clergy controlled the peasantry, but not the intelligentsia which had a curious relationship with the peasantry. They came from the peasantry, had ties with it, spoke in its name, yet the intelligentsia was creating an elite culture. *Auszra* and *Varpas* represented the intelligentsia's bid for leadership of the literate peasantry. Although not many peasants read *Auszra* and *Varpas*, the leadership of the Lithuanian nation would come from *Aušrininkai* and *Varpininkai*. But the clergy did not want to fall behind the secular press. They too pleaded the case of returning the Latin alphabet to the Lithuanians, but the clergy still maintained that Lithuania could not be socially, culturally or politically independent. If one were forced to choose an ally, then the Polish Catholics were better than the Russian Orthodox. With these attitudes the *Apžvalgininkai* could not take the lead in a nationalist movement.

Tėvynės Sargas [The Nation's Guardian, Tilsit, 1895-1904] took a more militant nationalist stance than *Apžvalga*. The Catholic press had to Lithuanianize itself before it could challenge the liberal press. The clergy would have to be as anti-Polish and nationalist as the *Aušrininkai* were. Even the Polonization of names on baptism certificates became an issue for the Lithuanian clergy. If they wanted to meet the challenge of the secular intelligentsia for the leadership of the peasantry, they had to become less Polish without becoming less Catholic. Under the leadership of an ultra-nationalist priest, Juozas Tumas-Vaižgantas (1869-1933), *Tėvynės Sargas* became the first modern Lithuanian Catholic publication. Conservative nationalism and Catholicism found a common home in *Tėvynės Sargas*. *Sargas* tried to differentiate between the Lithuanian clergy with a sense of nationalism and the Polish hierarchy, to which it was unwillingly subservient.

Tėvynės Sargas ran a column entitled "Iš Lietuvos Istorijos" [From Lithuania's history], which reviewed books on Lithuania's

history. Aleksandras Dambrauskas (1860-1938) wrote reviews of books primarily by Polish authors writing about Lithuania. He reviewed books by Antoni Mierzyński¹⁷ and Julius Latkauskis.¹⁸ Another critic analyzed Antoni Prochaska's book.¹⁹ Educated Lithuanians could agree with Polish historians even if their works did not portray Lithuania in a favorable light. The critics were genuinely interested in these books for their scholarly value. They did not engage in naïve sermonizing about paganism being akin to atheism nor did they attack Polish authors simply because of their nationality. Dambrauskas agreed with the Polish scholar that much of the allegedly prehistoric Lithuanian mythology was the creation of later chroniclers like Peter Dusburg rather than authentic. Though the quality of these reviews could be inconsistent, the chief editor Vaižgantas was confident enough in his nationality and his Catholicism that he could allow for what appeared to be dissenting views. So long as a Polish scholar was interesting and serious, Vaižgantas would give him credit. Vaižgantas had enough nationalist material that he did not have to descend into the arena of simple-minded polemics. So much Lithuanian material was being published at the time that even the tradition of translation began to wane. Rather than translating long passages from someone like Prochaska, *Tėvynės Sargas* chose to review Prochaska's books. The intelligentsia could read Prochaska in the original Polish; they did not need edited translations. Vaižgantas targeted *Tėvynės Sargas* for the intelligentsia more so than his Catholic predecessors.

Instead of portraying Jogaila's christening of Lithuania as a novel event in Lithuanian history, *Tėvynės Sargas* and individual clerics stressed the earlier christening of Mindaugas in 1251 and his subsequent coronation as king. Catholic writers skirted Mindaugas's subsequent apostasy. Admitting that Lithuania received a higher level of civilization from Poland has also presented problems for Lithuanian historians. Basing their interpretations on Peter Dusburg's *History of Prussia*, the Lithuanians simply turned the tables and asserted that pagan Lithuania had a higher level of civilization than the Slavs. If they wanted to retain their hold over the literate peasantry, the Catholics would have to invent a history compatible with the secular intelligentsia's views of history.

Before the nineteenth century the Polonized szlachta led the nation politically and culturally. After losing their leadership position following the two failed insurrections, the clergy replaced the szlachta as the leaders of the peasantry. But the intelligentsia perceived of themselves as more than leaders of the peasants; the intelligentsia would lead the nation. The szlachta and the clergy were too heavily Polonized to be Lithuanians.²⁰ Although the nationally conscious Lithuanian intelligentsia was exceptionally small, it would have to lead the Lithuanians. Because the clergy's concept of Lithuania was too theocratic, they could not lead a modern nation-state. Nevertheless, the church provided the Lithuanian national movement with many of its best writers. The intelligentsia could not simply dismiss the church. If the Lithuanian national movement would have any hope of spreading to the masses, the message of Lithuania's rebirth would have to come from the pulpit. The clergy had to divorce itself from the Polish hierarchy while still maintaining its loyalty to the Church.

Catholicism had created a religious community linking ethnic Poles and Lithuanians, which the nationalist intelligentsia would have difficulty breaking apart. Catholic publications like *Szvieša* or *Apžvalga* were not very bold in breaking the link from what at times appeared to be a Polish Church. Of course the clergy could always look back to their own nationalist hero, Valančius, but the Catholics had to wait until the turn of the century for priests like Maironis and Vaižgantas to articulate the same anti-Polish, anti-Russian, and anti-Semitic views that their secular countrymen did.

As part of the Polish identity, Catholicism played the role of virtually a national church in the Polish national movement. If Pole and Catholic were synonymous, then Lithuanians must also be Poles. If the Lithuanians wanted to be different from the Poles, the Roman Catholic Church could not play as strong a role in the Lithuanian national rebirth.²¹ Therein lay the dilemma. The Lithuanian intelligentsia needed the Church but the Church's identity was Polish. The Catholic press perceived a threat in the search for origins that obsessed Basanavičius and Šliūpas because it seemed pagan. Even the patriarch of the Lithuanian national clergy, Valančius, extolled the virtues of pagan Lithuania. For many secular Lithuanian activists, paganism had been the repository of Lithuanian virtue and greatness. Of course, no one called for a return to paganism, but the Lithuanian national rebirth would have to be a secular movement.

Even when *Szvieša* called for a new Lithuanian history it did so because history would engender "uplifting feelings and love for our dear nation."²² But *Szvieša* stressed the morality of "uplifting feelings," rather than nationality. A phrase like "our dear nation" in the pages of the Catholic press might mean the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. As was stated earlier, the Bishop of Sejny, Antanas Baranauskas, might write about "our dear nation" in the Lithuanian language and still denounce the Lithuanian national movement as separatist.

Catholic writers such as Jurgis Ažulaitis wanted a Lithuanian history that would not have the anti-clerical baggage of *Auszra* and *Daukantas*. Ažulaitis simply called for the printing of a newer history written by Jonas Maironis instead of publishing the outdated histories of *Daukantas*.²³ Lithuanian activists wanted a history written in modern Lithuanian rather than the Samogitian dialect which *Daukantas* used. Of course, it helped Ažulaitis's argument that Maironis was a priest and that the "pope of the atheists," Šliūpas, was backing the publishing of *Daukantas*'s works. But even Šliūpas knew that *Daukantas*'s histories no longer met the needs of the Lithuanian national revival. New sources had become available and Lithuanians wanted something more scientific than the works of *Daukantas*. Schools could use Maironis's history as a textbook whereas *Daukantas*'s works were arcane and obscure. Likewise, schools could not use the historical writings of the *Aušrininkai*. They were too disorganized and too secular for Catholic tastes. The *Šviesininkai* agreed with the secular intelligentsia that someone should write a new Lithuanian history that could unite the religious and secular wings of the Lithuanian national rebirth.

MAIRONIS

The first *Aušrininkas* to respond to Šliūpas's call for the writing of a "continuous history of our nation"²⁴ was Jonas Mačiulis (1862-1932). Better known by his pseudonym, Maironis, he wrote his *Apsakymai apie Lietuvos praeigą* [Tales about Lithuania's Past] in 1886 and published it in 1891. In it Maironis presented Lithuania's history as an unbroken chain of events from Lithuania's beginnings to his own time. The book went through four printings and eventually

Maironis simplified its name to *Lietuvos Praeitis* [Lithuania's Past].²⁵ Written in his student days and not based on primary materials, *Tales* is a compilation of the works of Strykowski, Narbutt, and Daukantas. Although he used the works of these historians as his main source, the Kievan historians may have had a greater influence on Maironis's concept of Lithuanian history.²⁶

Maironis wanted to study at Warsaw University, but instead he went to Kiev to study literature in the history and philology department.²⁷ Although Šliūpas knew the works of the Ukrainian historian Volodymyr Antonovych (1834-1908), he did not use him as extensively as Maironis. Maironis recognized that in certain instances Ukrainian and Russian historians had a more sympathetic view of Lithuania than the Poles. Another influential Ukrainian historian whom Maironis used was Nikolai Dashkevych (1852-1908). Dashkevych emphasized that medieval Lithuania was primarily a Russian-Lithuanian state. A Russian-Lithuanian state was no better than a Polish-Lithuanian state, but Maironis could use Dashkevych's arguments about Poland being the only beneficiary of the Union of Lublin.²⁸ The works of these two Ukrainian historians with their anti-Polish views fit nicely into Maironis's histories. No doubt Kiev affected Maironis, but because of his Catholic piety, the "Russian" spirit at the University disturbed Maironis and so he withdrew to study at the Kaunas Theological Seminary and later at the Theological Academy of St. Petersburg. Eventually he became the inspector and then the rector of the Kaunas Theological Seminary.²⁹ Maironis, however, is remembered primarily as the bard of the Lithuanian national rebirth.³⁰ As with so many of the activists of the Lithuanian national rebirth, history gave Maironis a context for his pursuits as an activist and a poet.

In the late nineteenth century, the Lithuanian peasantry had not yet developed a clear national identity nor was the Lithuanian national rebirth a mass movement. Nevertheless, peasant literacy was rising rapidly. To this day Lithuanian historians argue about how widespread the Lithuanian national movement was and when it became a mass movement. One can only presume that there were more people with a Lithuanian national identity during Maironis's lifetime than during Daukantas's. Still, there must have been very few Lithuanian peasants

with the national feelings of someone like Maironis. For all of Daukantas's rhetoric about writing for the common people, Daukantas wrote for a limited audience of the Lithuanian intelligentsia. Moreover, Daukantas's use of the regional Samogitian dialect made most of his works inaccessible to a larger audience. In spite of declarations of writing for the peasants, Daukantas's, Šliūpas's and Basanavičius's works were too esoteric for the masses. In contrast, Maironis was genuinely a popularizer who already had a larger nationally conscious reading audience.

Maironis personalized his nationalism by repeatedly using the words "we" or "our" in reference to Lithuania's history. Maironis wrote Lithuania's history as an insider for insiders. He did not reject scholarship, but he intended his works for his own people. Maironis's history even caught the attention of the Governor General of Vilnius who considered the *Tales* a "muzhik political catechism."³¹ The older clergy had feared the Russians, but Maironis's histories were supposed to help in the fight for national liberation from Tsarist rule. Furthermore, Maironis's history was catching people's attention with its contemporary style.

Maironis believed that nationalism was a universal phenomenon in which nations were connected to their past through history. What else would one call a medieval Grand Duke like Vytautas and a nineteenth-century activist like Maironis other than Lithuanians? Whether Vytautas had any notion of nationality was immaterial to Maironis because he believed that, "Every person has an inborn love of his fatherland, everyone holds his fatherland dear, but one is unable rationally to love one's country without knowing its past and history."³² Although Maironis believed such events as the Union of Lublin and the third partition were disastrous for Lithuania, he also believed that the Lithuanian nation survived: "Of course a nation's history does not end with the passing of our rulers and kings; if a single person speaks the fatherland's language, the spirit of the nation remains."³³ A parallel exists between the state and the nation's spirit. The state, however, is temporal and can die whereas the spirit of a nation is independent of such things as politics or territory. A nation could live on in its people even without a state. Yet, he tied together the history of the Lithuanian state with the Lithuanian language and

culture in ways that his predecessors had not. For him the backbone of national existence lay in national self-consciousness and culture.

As a priest, Maironis naturally considered Christianity superior to paganism. For Maironis, the christening of Lithuania was a belated but a necessary event that allowed Lithuania to integrate itself into the wider world of Western civilization.³⁴ Yet, the constant warfare of medieval Lithuania with the Teutonic Knights isolated Lithuania from the rest of Europe and retarded Lithuania's civilization, making it susceptible to assimilation with Polish culture.³⁵ On the one hand, the Teutonic Knights and the Poles delayed the formation of a Lithuanian national consciousness, but on the other hand, Polish interests in the Lithuanian language and folklore during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries became a catalyst for the Lithuanian national rebirth.

As a researcher, Maironis does not warrant any attention. His only value as a historian today is as a reflection of the Lithuanian rebirth's view of history.³⁶ For all of his amateurism, Maironis's common sense made him into a more critical historian than many of his contemporaries. Although he included many unsubstantiated myths about Lithuania's prehistory in his work, he was skeptical of some of the more blatantly exaggerated aspects of Lithuania's history. He used Strykowski, Narbutt, and Daukantas because their Lithuanian perspective made them the most "trustworthy," but he intuitively knew their weaknesses. Maironis's romanticism is seen best in his poetry, but unlike the Poles Narbutt or Kraszewski, Maironis did not include legends into his history. He doubted the claims of Teodor Narbutt that prehistoric Lithuanians had a runic alphabet. The fanciful accounts of someone like Narbutt no longer satisfied twentieth-century readers.

Historians disagree whether Maironis was a pioneer who successfully synthesized a modern concept of Lithuania or whether he was simply the best compiler of Lithuanian history. Maironis did not have the obsession with Lithuania's origins that Šliūpas and Basanavičius had. Nor does his history have the arcane arguments that Daukantas's histories had. Of Daukantas's *Tales* Maironis wrote: "while giving us much and at times new information, he did not write a pragmatic history but rather he presented us with material for a history but not a history in itself."³⁷ For Maironis, pragmatic meant something that

would inspire and raise morality.³⁸ Until the appearance of Antanas Alekna's (1872-1930) *Lietuvos Istorija* in 1911, high-school students used Maironis's history as the standard textbook for Lithuanian history.³⁹ Because he was a priest, an *Aušrininkas*, and a *Švieskininkas*, Maironis had the unique ability to synthesize the militant nationalist position with Catholicism.

Maironis believed that God's will was manifest in the nation. He emphasized that, "Love of the fatherland cannot exist without God's love."⁴⁰ Lithuania was dependent on God's will for its past and present. Maironis admitted that there were "rats" among the clergy, but he also believed that if "one distanced oneself from religion and the Church, then one distances oneself from the nation."⁴¹ Christianity would elevate Lithuania's culture and morality. Nevertheless, Maironis made an exception regarding Lithuania's christening. He wrote,

In all of Europe's nations, the introduction of the Christian religion coincides with the nation's first appearance in the historical arena, with that nation's rebirth, with the growth of her culture. The Lithuanian nation constitutes a sad exception. Lithuania's christening—that moment in history from which she slowly crawls downward, each time losing more of its political significance and its unique cultural independence, of which it had a considerable amount. How can we explain this?

First, the Lithuanian nation's tragedy was that Christ's teachings came to Lithuania not by the way of the cross but with the armed swords of the Order.... When the Poles brought that Christian religion, the Lithuanian nation felt as if it had been knocked over, mortally defeated, losing self-confidence, and it began to stagnate.

Second, the Lithuanian nation's tragedy was that spiritual missionaries did not bring Christ's teachings.... Polish political concerns brought Christ's gospels to Lithuania, pure, cold calculations, brought by a Polish priest who did not know the Lithuanian language.⁴²

In other words, the Poles halted Lithuania's cultural development, and the Poles retarded the spread of Christianity because Christianity came through the medium of the Polish language. Maironis believed

that Lithuania would have inevitably accepted Christianity. The Poles were unnecessary. In comparison to Daukantas and the *Aušrininkai*, Maironis is not original in his interpretation of Lithuania's christening. Yet, this interpretation of Lithuanian history needed an acceptable messenger to articulate it. Even the bogeyman of the clergy, Šliūpas, congratulated the priest Maironis for writing a pure history of Lithuania without foreign prejudices, based on a love of Lithuania.⁴³

At times Maironis's histories seem flat. Maironis had almost no notions of economics or social factors in history. He deals primarily with the chronology of Grand Dukes, wars, and politics. He did not do anything innovative in presenting Lithuania's past. Indeed, he seems to have clarified and simplified Lithuania's history. Instead of digressing into obscure arguments about the origins of the Lithuanians, Maironis adhered to a conventional idealization of the Grand Dukes. Many of the Polish-Lithuanian historians and chroniclers had emphasized the role of Vytautas in Lithuanian history, but Daukantas and the *Aušrininkai* become so preoccupied with their pet theories that they strayed from the traditional idealization of Vytautas. Whereas the earlier writers had been primarily interested in the origins of the Lithuanian language and prehistoric mythology, Maironis brought Vytautas back to the center of Lithuanian history. For Maironis, Vytautas the Great was equal in stature to Alexander the Great.⁴⁴ "Vytautas's rule is the greatest in Lithuanian history: never again, not before, not after has Lithuania been so strong and famous, then Lithuania was at its peak."⁴⁵ Maironis defended every one of Vytautas's actions. More importantly, Maironis remade a medieval lord into a nationalist hero. "Vytautas was not a Belarusin, nor a Pole, nor a German, but he was a real Lithuanian."⁴⁶ In his thoroughly documented works about Vytautas,⁴⁷ the Polish historian Antoni Prochaska tried to prove that he remained loyal to Jogaila and the Union with Poland. Maironis disagreed. He opposed any union with Poland. Jogaila betrayed Lithuania's interests while Vytautas protected them. Prochaska made Vytautas into a dependent vassal of Jogaila, whereas other historians had portrayed Vytautas as a troublesome but independent ruler of Lithuania. Poles like Prochaska and Kraszewski had always given credit to Vytautas for stopping the Tatar invasion of Europe, and in general Poles seem to have an affection for

Vytautas and his leadership at the Battle of Grunwald. However, Kraszewski and Prochaska had problems with the question of Vytautas's coronation as king of Lithuania. Some Polish historians believe that Vytautas's desire for an independent crown was nothing more than a German intrigue of the Emperor Sigismund and the Teutonic Knights to break the Polish-Lithuanian union. Just as the *Aušrininkai* had tried to refute the argument that the Lithuanian national rebirth was a Russian or German conspiracy aimed at undermining the solidarity between Lithuanians and Poles, so too Maironis argued that Vytautas was no one's pawn. Vytautas always fought for Lithuania's independence. If Vytautas or nineteenth-century Lithuanian activists found it necessary to take sides with Russians or Germans against the Poles for tactical reasons, that did not mean that the Lithuanians were serving anyone but themselves. Maironis pointed out that the Grand Dukes of Lithuania had always been kings albeit without an officially sanctioned crown from the pope. Furthermore, Maironis maintained with some truth that,

...it was Jogaila who had to bow down more often to the iron hand of Vytautas than the other way around, and when Jadwiga and Jogaila, whom the Poles had pressured, demanded loyalty from Vytautas, he gathered the Lithuanian boyars and had them renounce their oaths to Jogaila proving that he was the real ruler of Lithuania...he had no intention of uniting his fatherland to Poland as if it were some sort of province of Poland.⁴⁸

Modern historians have also been subject to reading the present back into the past. Historians dismiss Lithuania's medieval greatness because of its modern insignificance. The argument goes something like this: if Lithuania is small and insignificant today, then its size in the Middle Ages can only be explained in connection with Poland or Russia. Maironis wanted to counter this way of thinking by showing Vytautas's independence from Poland and his suzerainty over much of Russia. Clearly, Maironis projected his own feelings of nationalism onto Vytautas. Even the fact that Vytautas and Jogaila used Lithuanian to speak to each other became significant in elevating Vytautas's nationalist stature.⁴⁹ For Maironis, Vytautas had confronted the same cultural and political problems as the activists of the national rebirth.⁵⁰

Maironis also addressed the issue of Polonization. "Up to the time of Jogaila two nations made up Lithuania; the Lithuanians and the Belarusin/Russians.... After the Union of Lublin the Poles imperceptibly began to influence the Lithuanians, and the Lithuanians lost more as the Polish language began to take hold in Lithuania."⁵¹ Although Polonization did not start to take hold until much later, Maironis believed that the Act of Krewo initiated Lithuania's woes. Maironis believed that Poland gained political power, whereas Lithuania began to lose its sovereignty and eventually to lose its identity. Nevertheless, like many of his predecessor, Maironis presented an equivocal view of the Union of Lublin. On the one hand, he considered the Union of Lublin a disaster for Lithuania which in effect made Lithuania a Polish province; on the other hand, he maintained that Lithuania continued to exist as a nation and as an autonomous state.⁵²

Because Maironis published the *Tales* only in 1891, he wrote less than four pages on the history of the movement that he himself was a part of. He placed the Lithuanian nation rebirth in a broader context of European nationalism. He mentioned the 1831 and 1863 insurrections. Like Daukantas, he believed that the insurrections were Polish affairs that dragged the Lithuanian peasant into a hopeless fight against the Russians. The reaction against Russification and the press ban were more important for the Lithuanian national cause than the insurrections. Maironis summed up his attitude toward nineteenth-century Lithuanian history:

This overly strong and sharp Russification coupled with restriction and persecution of the Catholic Church under the guise of releasing us from the political domination of the Lithuanian magnates and boyars [Polonized lords] in fact pushed the Lithuanians even farther in the direction of the Poles; among the Lithuanian peasants—it elicited a reaction against Russification and Orthodoxy, and it created a national consciousness.⁵³

Maironis was the first to periodize the Lithuanian national rebirth, but he did not explain or justify his periodization very well. He began by giving credit for starting the Lithuanian national rebirth to the students and staff of the University of Vilnius. They were the first to become aware of their love for Lithuania—their fatherland. Of

course Maironis had in mind Mickiewicz and the other luminaries of the University of Vilnius who saw their fatherland, Lithuania, as a part of Poland. Maironis maintained that by the second quarter of the nineteenth century, the Lithuanian national rebirth had gained impetus and clarity regarding national identity, even though individuals like Narbutt, Bohusz, and Jucevičius still wrote in Polish. Simultaneously there appeared "pure" Lithuanians like Valančius and Daukantas, who started to awaken the masses. The next period in the Lithuanian rebirth was the freeing of the serfs, which had the result of allowing the well-to-do peasants to educate their children, and from that time "Lithuanianism" leaped forward to produce *Auszra* and the activists of the Lithuanian national rebirth. He considered the appearance of *Auszra* in 1883 to be as significant as the reign of any medieval Grand Duke. Maironis concluded his survey of the Lithuanian national rebirth by prophesying that,

the Lithuanians as a nation will with God's help recover and develop its own culture, whereas those who have banned our press (the Russians) and oppressed us in all sorts of inhuman ways will never achieve their desired result because oppression fires up a reaction and awakens those who were asleep and dormant.⁵⁴

Maironis may have formulated a theory of the Lithuanian national rebirth to create an impression that Lithuania had a future.⁵⁵ He therefore inflated the size and significance of Lithuania's past. He believed that the masses were awakening from their nationalist slumber and that they would regain their former greatness. In contrast, Narbutt had "broken his pen" with the Union of Lublin; Kraszewski believed that only pagan Lithuania was genuinely independent of all foreign influences, and of course Mickiewicz had relegated Lithuania to the distant past. Even Daukantas tended to see Lithuania's history in terms of contrasting Lithuania's medieval greatness with the Lithuania of serfdom and enslavement. Unlike the writers of the early nineteenth century, Maironis had to show that Lithuania was alive and well, and that Lithuania's history had not ended. Maironis imagined a community of Lithuanians that transcended time. Prehistoric, medieval, and nineteenth-century Lithuanians were one and the same.

THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF *VARPAS* AND THE *VARPININKAI*⁵⁶

With the demise of *Auszra*, *Szviiesa* inherited leadership of the Lithuanian national rebirth by default. It, however, did not satisfy the secularized Lithuanians living in Warsaw. The first newspaper to consolidate the liberal, socialist, and Catholic forces all under one roof was *Varpas* [Bell, Tilsit and Ragnit, 1889-1905]. Of course this Lithuanian solidarity could not last long, but initially it served its purpose of uniting the Lithuanian intelligentsia. Everything about *Varpas* was greater than its predecessors. It lasted longer (1890-1905) and had more subscribers, better writers, more issues and a more clearly articulated ideology than *Auszra*. *Varpas* spawned two offspring publications, *Ūkininkas* [Farmer] and an apolitical newspaper *Naujienos* [News] for the masses. The editors and writers of all three newspapers were the same.

The guiding light of *Varpas* was Vincas Kudirka (1858-1899). Although Basanavičius and many of the *Aušrininkai* participated in *Varpas*, Kudirka soon became the central figure in its existence.⁵⁷ A poet and publicist rather than a historian, Kudirka wrote what would become the Lithuanian national anthem. In the first stanza Kudirka invoked the past:

*Lithuania, our fatherland,
That land of heroes,
From the past let your sons
Draw strength.*

Unfortunately, a person as talented as Kudirka did not research the past. Nevertheless, to understand *Varpas*, the reader must understand who Kudirka was. His metamorphosis from a person of Polish culture to Lithuanian culture speaks directly to the issue of the development of a Lithuanian national identity.

More so than many of the activists of the Lithuanian rebirth, Kudirka was thoroughly Polonized. Mickiewicz, Kraszewski, and Słowacki were his idols. Later in life he became one of the best translators of Polish literature into Lithuanian. While still in high-school Kudirka edited and wrote an illegal satirical Polish language newspaper *Kłamstwo* [Lie]. Polish society could fully embrace a clever

young man from a Lithuanian peasant family as if he were a native Pole. After some unpleasant experiences in a seminary, Kudirka purposely chose to study at Warsaw University (1881-1888) rather than the more prestigious Moscow or St. Petersburg Universities. At the time Warsaw did not have a very distinguished university but at least it was closer to home and not so foreign to a Lithuanian.⁵⁸ After majoring in philology for a year, he transferred to medicine.

It was a time of Positivism and organic work in Warsaw.⁵⁹ Although Positivism gradually formed Kudirka, initially he associated with Ludwik Waryński's Polish socialist party "Proletariat"⁶⁰ and was arrested and jailed for his activities in the party.⁶¹ He was not, however, among the leaders of the organization, and so the Russian authorities released him from jail and eventually allowed him to return to the University.

More important for Kudirka's intellectual formation was his "conversion" to the Lithuanian national cause. In his memoirs he wrote about his high-schools days when he considered himself a Lithuanian and a Pole, with the Polish element predominating.⁶² Later upon reading *Auszra*, Kudirka sarcastically wrote "'the children are playing,' I thought to myself in Polish."⁶³ In a letter to his friend Jonas Jablonskis,⁶⁴ Kudirka called the Moscow Lithuanian club "the mutual admiration society."⁶⁵ Suffice it to say that Kudirka relished his Polish identity, while being ashamed of his peasant roots. In spite of his earlier feelings, Kudirka changed. In his memoirs he recounts a transformation of identity that borders on a religious experience.⁶⁶

Soon after Kudirka's conversion he started to contribute articles to *Auszra*. By 1888 he had become a leader among the Warsaw Lithuanian students.⁶⁷ With his friends, he organized "Lietuva," an association whose goals were: 1) to spread enlightenment, 2) to resurrect Lithuanian writing and art and to raise the national spirit, 3) to raise the farmer's standard of living, 4) and to extend the boundaries of "Lithuanianism."⁶⁸ Finally, the members of "Lietuva" decided to publish *Varpas*.

In a letter to Basanavičius, Kudirka rejected the idea of resurrecting *Auszra* because he believed that the clergy would not support it, but he did not want to alienate Basanavičius or Šliūpas either. Kudirka therefore proposed a "moderate" newspaper that would avoid

disputes, especially with the clergy.⁶⁹ In reality the *Varpas* olive branch to the clergy was nothing new, but Kudirka believed it was, and in its impact it was more important than its contemporaries.

The first editor of *Varpas*, Jonas Gaidamavičius, stated its goals: to have "Lithuanians think like Lithuanians...to raise Lithuania spiritually and economically, to throw off the habit of the Lithuanians of tying themselves to other nations...."⁷⁰ Possibly its most difficult task was to have its readers think like Lithuanians. Ostensibly *Varpas* would deal primarily with raising the people's national consciousness. The *Varpininkai* assumed they could accomplish this through an emphasis on self-reliance and economic betterment. *Varpas* printed instructional "how to" articles, but more often the articles were theoretical. It remained a publication for the intelligentsia who presumably had already attained a certain standard of living. More than *Auszra*, *Varpas* was primarily a political newspaper that criticized the tsarist regime.

Kudirka often quoted Marx in *Varpas*, but he was neither a socialist nor a Marxist. Being secular, liberal, and anti-Tsarist might make Kudirka a socialist in the eyes of a Catholic peasantry, but in reality he was much too conservative and nationalist to maintain his earlier ties with Polish radicals. The paradox of Kudirka was that he could simultaneously be a revolutionary and a conservative. He wanted to replace the Polish lord and the Russian bureaucrat with an educated Lithuanian, but he was enough of a realist to know that revolution could not succeed.

Kudirka and the *Varpininkai* looked to the Polish Positivists.⁷¹ The tone, sarcasm and realism of Świętochowski, Dygasinski, and Ochorowicz as well as of the Positivist newspapers *Prawda* and *Głos*, echoed in *Varpas* and in Kudirka's works. Organic work, raising the standard of living, and education, and a moderate political outlook coupled with nonviolent means and a demand for Lithuanian autonomy within the Russian empire reflected Kudirka's personal views and those of the Lithuanian positivists.⁷² Instead of blaming foreigners for Lithuania's woes, they looked internally for the sources of Lithuania's downfall. Maybe the only difference between the *Varpininkai* and the Polish Positivists was the demand for Lithuanian autonomy within the Russian empire. For different reasons, by the

turn of the century few Poles and Lithuanians wanted to resurrect the old Commonwealth of both Nations.

Positivism in Lithuania did not create a school of history, but it created an attitude toward history that was in some ways anti-historical. The distant past did not interest the *Varpininkai*. Unlike the *Aušrininkai*, the *Varpininkai* preoccupied themselves with recent history and current events.⁷³ Although the *Varpininkai* would invoke history, it had to be a useful and scientific history. Reality replaced the idealized depiction of Lithuania's past. Romanticizing Lithuania's past had led to two failed insurrections, the closing of a university and a press ban. Where Basanavičius demanded that Lithuanians know their history, the *Varpininkai* believed that history should serve some practical purpose. A factor that inhibited the professionalization of history in Lithuania may have been the attitude that history was of little practical use. Moreover, the profession of a historian offered no financial reward. If the *Aušrininkai* were like Turgenev's fathers, then the *Varpininkai* were like the sons. They were modern.

Many of the *Varpininkai* looked on much of Lithuania's history as a foreign history, that is, as an aristocratic Polish history unrelated to the lives of the peasants. Much like the Poles, the *Varpininkai* began to see parts of Lithuania's history as a division of Poland's history, and they opposed a romanticized patriotic history that simply played on people's emotions.⁷⁴ The editors of *Varpas* rejected much of the sickly sweet historical poetry that so characterized *Auszra*. Though Kudirka was an important Lithuanian poet, didactic prose dominated *Varpas*. Only about a quarter of the articles printed in *Varpas* dealt with history, and of these articles about half dealt with contemporary Western European history. At times the *Varpininkai* felt that European politics might have a greater impact on Lithuanian history than the study of medieval Lithuania. They portrayed the deeds of liberators like O'Connell and Kossuth with enthusiasm. They paid special attention to the history of the 1848 revolutions. The *Varpininkai* would often report on the national movements in the Ukraine and Serbia.

Some years *Varpas* had no history articles at all. Only in 1902, in an anniversary issue commemorating the twentieth anniversary of the appearance of *Auszra*, did *Varpas* print articles based on the memoirs of the *Aušrininkai*.⁷⁵ Among the most interesting were the memoirs of

Basanavičius and Šliūpas, in which they aired dirty laundry concerning *Auszra* and the pre-*Auszra* years. *Varpas* was not completely anti-historical. The *Varpininkai* filled its pages with historical arguments. It reported on the latest archeological findings in Lithuania, no matter how seemingly insignificant they were. But *Varpas* did react against the earlier preoccupation with searching for the origins of the Lithuanians. More than its forerunners, *Varpas* dealt with the economic forces that shaped Lithuania's history. Instead of blaming the Poles for serfdom, *Varpas* dealt with the economic origins of serfdom. *Varpas* included articles that would trace the history of collective and capitalistic farming. For the *Varpininkai*, economics determined the formation of nations and national consciousness more than feelings about language or history.⁷⁶ The *Varpininkai* introduced a sophistication into the interpretation of Lithuanian history. They would use history more often as a tool to polemicize with the Poles. For the *Varpininkai* the argument was more important than the research.

Many of the *Varpininkai* believed that the lack of unity and enlightenment among Lithuanians and not solely Lithuania's association with Poland had caused Lithuania's demise. *Varpas* still maintained an anti-Polish position, but it abandoned some of the more simplistic and bigoted views that appeared in *Auszra*. Some *Varpininkai* even suggested that the Poles were an oppressed nation just like the Lithuanians and that cooperation could be possible between the two nations. *Varpas* reported on the Polish national movement in Silesia, drawing parallels between themselves and the Poles. *Varpas*, however, stated clearly that Lithuania should be autonomous within the Russian empire.

A series of unsigned articles summed up the *Varpas* position on Lithuanian-Polish relations. The articles asserted, "The Poles say that we are not grateful for receiving Christianity and civilization from them."⁷⁷ Much like the Catholic press had earlier, *Varpas* presented a deterministic interpretation of Lithuania's christening. They claimed that, if not for the Teutonic Knights, with time Lithuania would have accepted Christianity.⁷⁸ "The Poles invited Jogaila to their throne so that they could save themselves from destruction by the Teutonic Knights."⁷⁹ Basing his arguments on the works of the conservative Polish historian Michał Bobrzyński, the author argued that the Union of Lublin saved Poland from destruction and that internal factors

caused the partitions of Poland. The article does not break any new ground, but it combined a determinist view with the old positions held by Daukantas and the *Aušrininkai*.

The *Varpininkai* maintained a fairly consistent attitude about the Lithuanian national rebirth. Rather than seeing Lithuania's history as an unbroken thread that linked nineteenth-century Lithuanian peasants with the medieval Grand Dukes as Maironis did, the *Varpininkai* saw nationalism as something new. Instead of looking at the usual turning points in Lithuanian history such as the christening of Lithuania, the Union of Lublin, or the partitions, the *Varpininkai* interpreted the freeing of the serfs in 1861 as the defining moment in the development of Lithuanian nationalism. The *Varpininkai* may have been the first to propose the idea that the late nineteenth-century Lithuanians were not the historical descendants of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The *Varpininkai* realized that the Lithuanians of the *Auszra* and *Varpas* epoch were Lithuanian nationalists while Vytautas and the medieval Grand Dukes could not be.

In many ways the *Varpininkai* wrote the most interesting and original history about their own experiences with the Lithuanian national rebirth. In an article in *Varpas* in 1893, Petras Matulaitis (1856-1900) admitted that one reason for the Polonization of the Lithuanian szlachta was the higher level of Polish culture.⁸⁰ Matulaitis further reasoned that,

serfdom saved the lower classes from Polish culture because... the boyar and the simpleton belong to completely different spheres, and so the Lithuanian boyar had no impact on the lower classes.... The Polonized priest had a greater influence on the people.⁸¹

Matulaitis then surveyed the positive influences of the Reformation on Lithuanian literacy. In the case of the Reformation and the Lithuanians living in East Prussia, we have a movement and a people that transcended the experience of Polish-Lithuanian relations. Historically, the Prussian-Lithuanians were Protestants and influenced by German culture. Lithuania minor had never been part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania or its ethnos, and yet, because of their Lithuanian language, the Lithuanian activists regarded the *Lietuvinkai*⁸² as part of the Lithuanian nation, whereas the activists increasingly excluded

the Polonized Lithuanian szlachta from their concept of who was a Lithuanian.

Much like Daukantas and the *Aušrininkai* had previously, Matulaitis interpreted the 1863 insurrection as a Polish affair that the Lithuanians did not participate in extensively. In addition to mixed interpretations of the 1863 insurrection, Lithuanian historians have had a love-hate relationship with Murav'ev, the hangman of Vilnius. He imposed the press ban, was the most ardent of Russifiers, but "Murav'ev's iron hand suppressed the Polish years,"⁸³ for which the Lithuanians were grateful. Matulaitis also gave a bleak view of the pre-*Auszra* years:

After the Polish years no one tried to do anything. The impetus that Daukantas and Valančius had given the national current completely exhausted itself, and Lithuania sank into a lethargic sleep; the intelligentsia became Polish or Muscovite, while the common people burdened with all sorts of taxes, spiritually downtrodden, stagnated in their smoke-filled huts and remained quiet.⁸⁴

Of course *Auszra* emerged from this national despair to reawaken the Lithuanian nation. Matulaitis believed that *Auszra* brought about the Lithuanian national rebirth. To this day many Lithuanian and Polish historians accept this rather simple interpretation of the beginnings of the Lithuanian national rebirth. Nevertheless, like many Positivists, Matulaitis called for practical deeds:

If you want to consider yourself a Lithuanian patriot, you need to do more than just speak Lithuanian, you need to work. Today's newspapers not only defend the use of our language, but they explain the socio-political injustice in Lithuania, and overall they enlighten the people's minds.⁸⁵

Matulaitis ended his article with a remarkably optimistic prediction that Lithuania might be free in the next ten years.⁸⁶ For all of Matulaitis's rambling, he made some candid admissions about the higher level of Polish culture; about Murav'ev's policies, which paradoxically advanced the Lithuanian national rebirth; and the paucity of "Lithuanianism" before the appearance of *Auszra*.

In spite of their modern and positivist views, the *Varpininkai* would still write about the Middle Ages. Rather than do their own research, however, which many of the *Varpininkai* realized they were untrained to do, they continued the tradition of Lithuanianizing histories written by foreigners. Just like the earlier Lithuanian activists, the *Varpininkai* edit out whatever was unfavorable to a Lithuanian viewpoint then translate the remainder. Often the translator would paraphrase the original author so extensively that the translation would barely be recognizable. The editors of *Varpas* also had a wider choice of authors to choose from for translation. They stopped translating the old historians like Narbutt or Kraszewski and began to include contemporary historians who were either favorable to the Lithuanians or unfavorable to the Poles. In a group of articles serialized over eight issues Jonas Staugaitis (1868-1952) edited and Lithuanianized Józef Wolff's and Kazimierz Stadnicki's works.⁸⁷ In the same vein Staugaitis compiled the archeological findings of Tadeusz Dowgird (1852-1919). Because Dowgird was sympathetic to the Lithuanians, at least he could recognize his work in Lithuanian translation.

The *Varpininkas* Gabrielius Landsbergis,⁸⁸ in his *Lenkai ir Lietuviai: nuo 1228 m. iki 1430 m* [Poles and Lithuanians: from 1228 to 1430], best illustrates the culture of translation and the use of Polish historians. In the introduction to his *Poles and Lithuanians*, Landsbergis says that he will extensively translate and use only Polish historians to avoid the criticism of being tendentious.⁸⁹ Lithuanian activists realized that the best critics of Polish history were the Poles themselves. The Lithuanians could "hang" the Poles with their own material. All the Lithuanians had to do was translate the right author and the right passage.

The closing of the University of Vilnius in 1832 left a vacuum that the activists of the Lithuanian national rebirth attempted to fill. We have seen what happens when amateurs and those with nationalist agendas take over the study of history. The most qualified group of scholars to fill the void left by the closing of the University of Vilnius were Poles. In many ways the historians from the Jagiellonian University in Cracow inherited an interest in Lithuanian history from the University of Vilnius. The Cracow school of historians, with their criticism of Polish institutions and their generally pessimistic view of Polish history, unwittingly became a source for Lithuanian translators.

One of the most useful of the Cracow school historians for the Lithuanians was Michał Bobrzyński (1849-1935).⁹⁰ Because Bobrzyński believed internal factors caused Poland's ruin, his interpretation of such events as the Union of Lublin and the partitions was compatible with Lithuanian prejudices. Polish historians like Bobrzyński could disparage their own history better than the *Varpininkai*, who did not have the competence that the historians at the Jagiellonian University had.

In spite of some of their anti-historical views, the *Varpininkai* brought the first traces of a more professional and modern approach to Lithuania's history. Of course, writers like Valančius and Stanevičius had introduced critical and scientific attitudes into Lithuanian history earlier in the nineteenth century, but they were not professionals. A new generation of university-trained students, who by the early twentieth century laid the foundations for the professionalization of the humanities, had their first taste of Lithuanian activism in *Varpas*. For instance, in a report on the ninth Congress of Russian Archeologists held in 1893 in Vilnius, Jonas Jablonskis complained about the means by which the Russians excluded several Lithuanian and Polish archeologists from the conference. Nevertheless, a Pole, Antoni Mierzyński, presented a paper at the conference about Lithuanian mythology. Mierzyński (1829-1907) was a classical philologist who did extensive research on Baltic religions. Mierzyński systematically picked apart and destroyed dearly-held Lithuanian myths like the belief in the *Krivė*. Mierzyński conclusively exposed the inaccuracies found in the medieval chronicles of Peter Dusburg and the sixteenth-century works of Simon Grunau and Jan Lasicki that first mentioned the *Krivė*. In his report on the conference Jablonskis did not know quite what to make of Mierzyński's attack on these romantic notions of Lithuanian paganism. Was Mierzyński merely engaging in an anti-Lithuanian polemic, which stressed the backwardness and low level of civilization in prehistoric Lithuania? Jablonskis admitted that Mierzyński had put the study of Lithuanian mythology on a "truly scholarly foundation." Nevertheless, Jablonskis believed that Mierzyński "was trying to destroy all our present-day knowledge about the *Krivė* and all the hierarchies of the ancient Lithuanian organizations."⁹¹ In a review of Mierzyński's *Źródła do mitologii litewskiej od Tacyta do końca XIII wieku* [Sources of Lithuanian

mythology from Tacitus to the End of the 13th Century], Vincas Pietaris savagely attacked Polish scholars for intentionally distorting information about Lithuania. Yet, in this same review Pietaris concluded that Mierzyński's book was necessary for any serious scholar who wanted to understand Lithuanian mythology.⁹²

The Polish philologist Aleksander Brückner (1856-1924) joined in this polemic by maintaining that there was nothing particularly unique or exceptionally old about Lithuania's prehistory as some older philologists had asserted.⁹³ While both Mierzyński and Brückner did valuable research in Lithuanian mythology, Brückner seems to have been on a crusade to diminish the level of prehistoric Lithuanian culture. Just as Lithuanian activists and scholars did not constitute a monolith, so too Polish academics did not present a united front in relation to Lithuanian interests. Too often Lithuanians would assail Polish authors simply because they were Polish and therefore inherently suspect. Yet, because of Polish cultural and historical connections, the Lithuanians could not get by without Polish scholarship. Of course, publicists on both sides uninterested in research would use any argument no matter how distorted to further their nationalist agendas.

The younger generation of Lithuanian scholars could not leave Mierzyński's and Brückner's challenges to Lithuanian sensibilities unanswered. The distinguished linguist Kazimieras Būga (1879-1924) joined in the attack against Mierzyński in a youthful, unscholarly fashion. The new generation of what would soon become professional historians and linguists initially responded in the same manner as Daukantas or the *Aušrininkai* to unfavorable interpretations of Lithuania's history. Eventually this had to change. By the early twentieth century, linguists like Jablonskis and Būga and the historians Totoraitis and Janulaitis quietly accepted the suppositions of some of the better Polish scholars like Mierzyński, even if they did not like their conclusions. In the same vein, Jablonskis, Būga, Totoraitis, and Janulaitis began to criticize some of the archeological, linguistic, and historical research of Basanavičius and the *Aušrininkai*. Yet, *Varpas* only hinted at the professionalization of the humanities. The younger generation of *Varpininkai* still paid their respects to the likes of Daukantas or Basanavičius. In a review of Basanavičius's *Etnologiškos smulkmenos* [Ethnographic Details], Jablonskis, in a

very tentative manner, criticized Basanavičius's methods. Though they aimed *Varpas* at the intelligentsia, it was not a scholarly journal. One could still find articles about medieval heroics. The push toward a critical attitude about their own history is not overly apparent in the pages of *Varpas*, but it was more critical than its predecessors.

If *Auszra* demonized the Poles and the religious press demonized Russian Orthodoxy, then *Varpas* shifted its invectives toward the Russian government. One would still find articles that repeat the naive anti-Polish ideas found in *Auszra*, for the *Varpininkai* realized that anti-Polonism was an accepted formula for fostering Lithuanian nationalism. Still, the Lithuanian intelligentsia wanted more. They wanted variety. *Varpas* reported on the international workers movement. They even translated articles from American journals about the activities of Russian revolutionaries. In an article about the national question, Pranas Mašiotas portrayed the "real" battle for Lithuania as a struggle between ruling and enslaved nations.⁹⁴ At times the *Varpininkai* would contradict each other. Nothing in *Varpas* or the Lithuanian national rebirth was monolithic. For instance, in early 1901 Jonas Vileišis wrote, "Let us raise our standard of living, let us expand industry, let us spread education but let us not provoke the government."⁹⁵ Later in the same year Povilas Višinskis called for a "free, independent Lithuania, free of foreign depots."⁹⁶ He called for the removal of foreign (Russian) and domestic (Polish) lords. Kudirka also believed that the greatest barrier to Lithuania's resurrection was tsarist rule. According to Kudirka the Russians had been a immobile block against progress.⁹⁷ Only after Tsar Alexander III's death did Kudirka raise his hopes that Nicholas II would reform Russia. But Kudirka's protégé Kapsukas did not.

In 1902 Vincas Mickevičius [pseud. Kapsukas] (1880-1935) became one of the co-editors of *Varpas*. Later he became the editor or contributor to a host of other publications, including *Ūkininkas* [Farmer], *Lietuva*, and *Draugas*.⁹⁸ In 1918 Kapsukas would become more infamous as the head of the Lithuanian Soviet Republic.⁹⁹ This raises the question as to how socialist was *Varpas*. The problem with assessing *Varpas* socialism is that, while it was being published, leftists and future Communists like Kapsukas and the physician and historian Stasys Matulaitis (1866-1956) were still relatively young and

isolated from radical revolutionaries and were still more involved with Lithuanian issues than in the broader issues of a revolution in Russia.

With time Kapsukas became more interested in solving Lithuania's problems by having the Lithuanians participate in Russian revolutionary activities. During his *Varpas* years, however, Kapsukas still did not differentiate between the persecution of Russian revolutionaries and the injustices perpetrated by the Russian authorities against the Catholic church. Several times Kapsukas complimented the Church on its resistance to Russification. The tsar was an enemy to the Lithuanians and the Russian lower classes. In 1904 Kapsukas wrote a series of articles under the pseudonym "Revoliucionierius" in which he traced Russian radicalism from the late eighteenth century to his own time.¹⁰⁰ While this history of Russian radicalism may have been pertinent to the eventual creation of Soviet Lithuanian historiography, the articles have nothing to do with ethnic Lithuania. Initially, Kapsukas was a liberal nationalist, but he eventually drifted off into the wider world of Russian communism. Kapsukas was a Lithuanian, but Communism's concerns were too entangled with Russian affairs to be of use to the activists of the Lithuanian rebirth.

Because a peasant nation could not produce enough ethnic Lithuanian workers, socialism in the Marxist sense has never taken root in Lithuania. Perhaps a more typical Lithuanian socialist of the *Varpas* era was Jonas Biliūnas (1879-1907). He was primarily a writer of short stories, whose early fiction has a propagandistic quality. Some of the titles include *Pirmutinis Streikas* [The First Strike] and *Be darbo* [Unemployed]. Eventually, Biliūnas became more sentimental, psychological, and lyrical in his choice of subjects and style. After he contracted tuberculosis, he withdrew from socialist activities and became religious. Populism, socialism, humanism, and more precisely, a concern with social justice, characterize Biliūnas's later works. Among his history pamphlets, one dealt with the workers' movement in Vilnius.¹⁰¹ Others dealt with events like the assassination of Tsar Alexander II.¹⁰² He based these pamphlets more on his own memory than on research. The workers' movement in Vilnius was no doubt primarily a Polish movement. Consequently, Biliūnas writes about the friction between the Vilnius-based *Związek robotniczy na Litwie* [The Workers' Union in Lithuania], and the Polish Socialist Party (PPS). Biliūnas resented the "Polish spirit" of

the Lithuanian workers and the attempts of the PPS to dominate the Vilnius workers.¹⁰³ Because of the various national intrigues between these groups, Biliūnas became more nationally conscious than most of the members of what would eventually become the Lithuanian Social Democratic Party (LSDP), hence Biliūnas's eventual disenchantment with what was essentially a foreign movement. Perhaps because he did not live long enough, Biliūnas did not "dirty" his hands with communism. Unlike Kapsukas, Biliūnas has retained his nationalist credentials. Like many socialists of national minorities in the Russian empire, Lithuanian socialists at the turn of the century did not differentiate sharply between socialism and nationalism. Certainly, the pamphlets of Biliūnas or Kapsukas did not constitute a school of history. Although they saw connections between themselves and the revolutionaries in Russia, their historical writings still had a nationalist focus.

* * *

As historians, the successors of the *Aušrininkai* were not as productive as their predecessors. Because the national rebirth was so small, anyone participating in *Ausra* imagined that they had common concerns with other Lithuanians. The *Aušrininkai* continued in the forefront of the Lithuanian national rebirth. The appearance of different interpretations of Lithuania's history did not represent a splintering of the greater idea of "Lithuanianism." In the post-*Ausra* era, Catholicism and liberalism eventually produced ideological divisions among the nationally conscious Lithuanians. Basanavičius and Šliūpas would ultimately become conservative nationalists whereas Kapsukas eventually became a Stalinist hack. All three contributed articles to *Varpas*, and all three saw the Poles and the Russians as oppressors. They worked and wrote under the umbrella of Lithuanian nationalism.

Ironically the liberal position spawned very different movements. Originally, liberalism meant nothing more than secularism, a world-view which has never won broad acceptance in the Lithuanian countryside. Nevertheless, liberalism gave birth to conservative nationalism, socialism, and liberal democracy. Historiographically, nuances would exist between these different positions, but Lithuanian

historiography has never freed itself from Daukantas, *Auszra*, and Polish romanticism. Blatantly naive historical accounts gave way to something more sophisticated and suitable for the intelligentsia, but the basic prejudices and framework visibly survived in the more critical writing of national history. Even the notion that the modern Lithuanian nation had its origins with *Auszra* did not have wide support other than with the *Varpininkai*. Like many nationalists Lithuanians still prefer to see their past as an unbroken chain that links the present with the past. Even the *Varpininkai* would not cut themselves off from the medieval Grand Dukes. The liberals' accent on class differences in Lithuanian history also had its origins in nationalism rather than Marxism. By definition a Lithuanian was or had come from the peasantry, whereas the upper classes were foreign.

As with earlier works by the participants of the Lithuanistics movement, many of the *Varpininkai* did not make a sharp distinction among disciplines such as anthropology, archeology, and history. The Russian language work *Антропологическая характеристика Жмудзинов* [The Anthropological Characteristics of the Samogitians] by Povilas Višinskis (1875-1906) mixed history, photography, and geography to produce a study of Samogitia reminiscent of the Lithuanistics movement. Stasys Matulaitis (1866-1956) did not write any major historical works before 1904, but in the 1930's the Belarus Academy of Science awarded him a doctorate for his work on the 1863 insurrection in Lithuania. During the *Varpas* years he was neither a mature historian nor a Communist, as he would eventually become. The youth of many of the *Varpininkai* and *Šviesininkai* prevented them from producing polished works of scholarship. They often produced their best works when Lithuania was already an independent nation.

NOTES

1. Aleksandravičius and Kulakauskas, *Carų valdžioje*, 177.
2. A person associated with *Szvieša*, usually a staunch Catholic.
3. Edvārdas Vidmantas, *Katalikų Bažnyčia ir Nacionalinis Klausimas Lietuvoje XIXA. Antrojoje Pusėje - XXA. Pradžioje* [The Catholic Church and the National Question in Lithuania in the Second Half of 19th Century and the Start of the 20th century] (Vilnius: Mokslas, 1987), 65.
4. Martynas Jankus [pseud. J. S.....?], "Apie įvedimą katalikizmo tikėjimo Lietuvoje" [About the Introduction of Catholicism into Lithuania], *Szvieša*, 3 (Tilsit), March 1888, 66.
5. Jonas Dainauskas has compiled a comprehensive list of all the pseudonyms of the *Aušrininkai*. The pseudonyms of the post-*Auszra* era, however, still present problems. Vaclovas Biržiška attempted to make a comprehensive list but his work has gaps and inconsistencies. See *Lietuviškieji Slapyvardžiai ir Slapyraidės*. [Lithuanian Pseudonyms and Pseudo initials] (Kaunas: Bibliografijos Žinių Priedas, 1943). The Bibliographic and Book Research Center of the Lithuanian Martynas Mažvydas National Library has undertaken the most ambitious project to solve the problem of Lithuanian pseudonyms. At the time of the writing of this study, they have only published the first volume which included the letters A-F. See Regina Varnienė et al., eds., *Lietuviškieji Slapyvardžiai: Medžiaga Lietuviškųjų Slapyvardžių Sąvadas* [Lithuanian Pseudonyms: Material about the Collection of Lithuanian Pseudonyms] (Vilnius: Lietuvos Nacionalinė Martyno Mažvydo Biblioteka Bibliografijos ir Knygotyros Centras, 1995). The reason for so much difficulty with pseudonyms is that often the authors would change their pseudonym; most authors used multiple pseudonyms and there is no logic in deciphering Lithuanian pseudonyms. Often the pseudonym became more famous than the real name.
6. Jankus, "Apie įvedimą katalikizmo tikėjimo Lietuvoje," 66.
7. In the Act of Krewo of 1385, among other pledges Jogaila agreed to baptize Lithuania, marry Jadwiga the Queen of Poland, and most importantly unite Lithuania and Poland. Modern Lithuanians, however, do not feel they had been incorporated into Poland. See Jerzy Ochmański, *Historia Litwy* (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1990), 72.
8. Danielius Jankūnas [pseud. D. Samogytis], "Keli žodžiai susilenkavusiu ir norincziu susilenkoti Lietuvui" [Several Words to those Polonized and Those wanting to Polonize Lithuania], *Szvieša*, 3, March 1888, 88.
9. *Ibid.*
10. Petras Leonas [pseud. Petras Liūtas], "Pabaiga gyvenimo Vytauto" [The End of Vytautas's Life], *Szvieša*, 4/5 April-May 1888, 97.
11. At the Congress of Luck in 1429, the Holy Roman Emperor Sigismund raised the question of Vytautas's coronation. Jogaila and the Polish nobles left the congress in protest. Vytautas's death in 1430 cut short his plans to become king of Lithuania.
12. *Ibid.*, 118.
13. Jonas Kriaučiūnas [pseud. Jons], trans. from Polish. "Apie kunigą Stanislova Staszicą" [About the Priest Stanisław Staszic], *Ibid.*, 128-141.
14. Kazimieras Pakalniškis [pseud. Szermunelis], *Žemaičių ir Lietuvos Apžvalga*, 6 (Tilsit), March 15, 1892, 42.
15. One of *Apžvalga*'s editors, Kazimieras Pakalniškis, came the closest to calling for resistance to tsarist rule. A government which persecutes Catholics is ordained not by

God but by the devil, and therefore the Church did not prohibit resistance to such a government. He considered Christian morality the best weapon against tsarist religious oppression. Kazimieras Pakalniškis, "Pastaras šio meto "Apžvalgos" numeris" [The Last issue of This Year's *Apžvalga*], *Žemaičių ir Lietuvos Apžvalga*, 24, 1891, 185-186.

16. *Ibid.*, 44.

17. Aleksandras Dambrasas [pseud. Kuronelis?], review of *Mythologiae Lithuanicae Monumenta*, by Antoni Mierziński, in *Tėvynės Sargas*, 6 June 1896, 37.

18. Dambrasas, review of *Mendog Król Litewski* [Mindaugas King of the Lithuanians] by Julius Latkauskis, in *Ibid.*, 40.

19. Antanas Kaupa [pseud. K. A. K.], review of *O Prawdziwosci listów Gedymina* [About the Authenticity of Gediminas's Letters] by Antoni Prochaska, in *Tėvynės Sargas*, 12 December 1896, 37.

20. Kazimieras Propolanis, *Polskie apostołstwo w Litwie: szkic historyczny* [Polish Apostleship in Lithuania: A Historical Sketch] (Vilnius: Kuchty, 1913).

21. Meilė Lukšienė, *Demokratinė ugdymo mintis Lietuvoje* [The Idea of a Democratic Education in Lithuania] (Vilnius: Mokslas, 1985), 248.

22. Jurgis Ažulaitis, "Keliata žodžiu apie lietuviszkos istorijos reikalingumą" [Several Words about the Need for a Lithuanian History], *Szvietos Priedas* [Szvietas Supplement], 3 March 1888, 35.

23. *Ibid.*

24. Jonas Szliūpas, "Lietuviai kitą gadynę ir szendien" [Lithuanians in a Different Epoch and Today], *Ausra*, 8, 9, 10, November and December 1883, 221.

25. 1891, 1903, 1906, and 1926. Although the first three editions were essentially the same book, Maironis expanded the 1926 edition by over fifty pages. In the 1906 edition Maironis added a separately titled section called *Trumpa lietuvių rašliavos apžvalga* [A Short Survey of Lithuanian Writing]. At the time of the first printing Maironis used the pseudonym Stanyslovas Zanavykas.

26. Vanda Zaborskaitė, "Kijevo Istorikų Poveikis Maironio 'Apsakymas Apie Lietuvos Praeigą'," [The Influence of the Kievan Historians on Maironis's 'Tales of Lithuania's Past'], *Lietuvos TSR Mokslų Akademijos Darbai*, 2, no. 15 (Vilnius: 1963): 201-211.

27. With the closing of the University of Vilnius in 1832, the Northwestern regions were without a university. The Russians intended Kiev's St. Vladimir University as a Russian counterweight to the troublesome Polish University of Vilnius. Prospective students who wanted to study in Warsaw had to get special permission from the governor general of Vilnius. Belatedly Maironis received permission to go to Warsaw. Because he feared not being accepted in time for the start of the school year, he decided to go to Kiev University, where no special permission was required for Lithuanian students. Vanda Zaborskaitė, *Maironis* (Vilnius: Vaga, 1987), 35.

28. Ignas Jonynas, "Lithuania's historiography," in *Istorijos Baruose*, 169.

29. When he became the rector in 1909, in his inaugural speech he addressed the seminarians in the Lithuanian language, thereby breaking the custom of using Polish or Latin.

30. Lithuanians still consider Maironis their greatest poet. His histories have been virtually forgotten.

31. Zaborskaitė, *Maironis*, 55.

32. Maironis [pseud. Stanyslovas Zanavykas], *Apsakymai Apie Lietuvos Praeigą* [Stories of Lithuania's Past] (Tilsit: Mauderode, 1891) in Justinas Marcinkevičius, *Vitas*

Areška, and Vanda Zaborskaitė, eds., *Maironis Raštai* [Maironis's Writings], vol. 3 (Vilnius: Vaga), 439.

33. *Ibid.*, 575,

34. *Ibid.*, 52.

35. *Ibid.*, 53.

36. Zaborskaitė, *Maironis*, 47.

37. Maironis [pseud. Stanyslovas Zanavykas], *Apsakymai Apie Lietuvos Praeigą*, in *Maironis Raštai*, vol. 3, 439.

38. *Ibid.*, 440. Although there is no evidence that Maironis read Hegel, much of Maironis's philosophy of history seems straight out of Hegel. Maironis's concept of pragmatic history conforms to Hegel's idea of pragmatic history. "Pragmatic reflections...belong indeed to the present, and the stories of the past are quickened into present-day life.... Here belong, in particular, moral reflections and the moral enlightenment to be derived from history;" G. W. F. Hegel, *Reason in History: A General Introduction to the Philosophy of History*, trans. Robert S. Hartman (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1953), 8.

39. Zenonas Pilkauskas, "XIX A. Pabaigos – XX A. Pradžios Istorijos Vadovėliai Lietuvoje" [Late 19th Century and Early 20th Century Primary School History Textbooks], *Istorija*, 14, no. 2 (Vilnius: 1974): 98.

40. Maironis, *Apsakymai Apie Lietuvos Praeigą*, in *Maironis Raštai*, vol. 3, 440.

41. Irena Slavinskaitė, "Maironis—Visuomeninkas Švietėjas" [Maironis—Activist and Enlightener], forward to *Ibid.*, 13.

42. Jonas Maironis, *Lietuvos praeitis* [Lithuania's Past] (Kaunas: Raidė, 1926) in *Maironis Raštai*, vol. 3, 106. The 1926 edition of Maironis's *Lietuvos praeitis* goes beyond the parameters of this study. Nevertheless, the 1926 edition differs from the 1891 edition only in being longer and more forceful.

43. Šliūpas quoted in Pranas Pauliukonis, "Maironis Istorikas" [Maironis the Historian], in Antanas Vaičiulaitis, ed., *Maironis* (Brooklyn: Aidų, 1963), 39.

44. Antoni Prochaska, *Ostatnie lata Witolda*, 341, quoted in *Ibid.*, 529.

45. Maironis, *Apsakymai Apie Lietuvos Praeigą*, in *Maironis Raštai*, vol. 3, 513.

46. *Ibid.*, 515. Historians disagree about Vytautas's reasons for fleeing to the Teutonic Knights and his betrayal of the Samogitians.

47. *Dzieje Witolda* (Vilnius: Rukowski, 1914), *Ostatnie lata Witolda* (Warsaw: Gebethner, 1882), *Król Władysław Jagiełło* (Cracow: Buczewicz, 1908), and *Codex Epistolaris Vitoldi, Magni Ducis Lithuaniae* (1882).

48. Maironis, *Apsakymai Apie Lietuvos Praeigą*, in *Maironis Raštai*, vol. 3, 515.

49. *Ibid.*, 575.

50. *Ibid.*, 516.

51. *Ibid.*, 175.

52. *Ibid.*, 177.

53. Maironis, *Lietuvos praeitis*, in *Maironis Raštai*, vol. 3, 207.

54. *Ibid.*, 578.

55. Juozas Jakštas, "Lietuvos Aušrine istoriografija Pagal Maironi ir Pietari" [Auszra's historiography according Maironis and Pietaris], *Aidai*, 7 (Brooklyn, NY: September 1971): 305-307.

56. A contributor to *Varpas*. The word connotes a liberal if not leftist in Lithuanian politics.

57. Kudirka himself was an *Aušrininkas*. Jonas Gadamavičius-Gaidys and Jonas Adomaitis-Šernas were also influential *Varpininkai*.

58. The language of instruction at Warsaw University was Russian, but Poles formed the majority of the student body. Kudirka attended the University from 1881 to 1888.

59. Having rejected the tradition of insurrections, the Warsaw Positivists emphasized the importance of cultural and economic progress. See Wandycz, *The Lands of Partitioned Poland*, 207.

60. The first congress of "Proletariat" met Vilnius in 1883. Ludwik Janawicz and Jonas Šliūpas translated the "Proletariat" manifesto and then organized its dissemination.

61. He was making hectographic copies of Marx's *Das Kapital*.

62. Vincas Kudirka, *Vinco Kudirkos Raštai*, ed. Juozas Gabrys (Tilsit: Mauderode, 1909), 211-214

63. *Ibid.*, 213.

64. Jonas Jablonskis (1860-1930) became the founder of standard modern Lithuanian.

65. Kudirka quoted in Julius Būtėnas, *Vincas Kudirka* (Vilnius: Vyturys, 1988), 60.

66. Kudirka, *Vinco Kudirkos Raštai*, 213. Kudirka wrote in his "Confession": "I quickly began to page through *Ausra*... I only remember that I stood up, bowed my head not daring to raise my eyes... it is as if I heard Lithuania's voice, simultaneously blaming me and forgiving me: where have you been so long? Then I became so emotional that I grabbed the table and cried. I was sad about those hours crossed out from my life as a Lithuanian. After that my chest became peaceful, feeling a joyful warmth with new resolve.... I felt great and powerful: I felt *I am a Lithuanian*." *Ibid.*, 214.

67. Warsaw had never been a center for Lithuanian activists as had St. Petersburg and Moscow. Nevertheless, people like Kudirka had a certain stamp on them. While they had the prerequisite anti-Polish attitudes, they were more anti-Tsarist than their Moscow counterparts, and they had more appreciation for Polish culture than the Lithuanians living in Russia.

68. Vaclovas Biržiška et al., eds., *Lietuvių Enciklopedija* (Boston: Lietuvių Enciklopedijos Leidykla, 1958) s.v. "Lietuva." The president of "Lietuva" was Jonas Gaidys-Gadamavičius, and Kudirka was its secretary. The organization did not dare to call itself a political party, but in fact it was the first Lithuanian political association. In a very conservative nation, "Lietuva" was the forerunner of liberalism. See Vincentas Lukoševičius, *Liberalizmo Raida Lietuvoje XIX a. pab.- 1940* [The Course of Liberalism in Lithuania from the Late 19th Century to 1940] (Vilnius: Valstybinis Leidybos Centras, 1995), 9.

69. Vincas Kudirka, "Letter to Basanavičius, 17 May 1888, Warsaw," *Raštai* [Writings], vol. 2 (Vilnius: Vaga, 1990), 810.

70. Jonas Gadamavičius, "Naujas laikraštis" [A new newspaper], *Varpas*, 1 (Tilsit), January 1890, 2.

71. Some disagreement exists among historians as to who the father of Lithuanian Positivism was. See Bronius Genzelis, "Pozityvistinės Idėjos Lietuvoje (XIX a.)" [Positivist Ideas in 19th-century Lithuania], *Problemos*, 1, no. 11 (1973): 64.

72. Lukoševičius, *Liberalizmo Raida Lietuvoje XIX a. pab.- 1940*, 21.

73. The *Varpininkai* and the *Aušrininkai* did not differ a great deal. Often they were the same people. Some claim that the *Aušrininkai* like Šliūpas and Vileišis had introduced positivism to the Lithuanians earlier. Nevertheless, the Lithuanian national rebirth had matured by the 1890's and *Varpas* represented a movement toward modernization.

74. Lukoševičius, *Liberalizmo Raida Lietuvoje*, 9.

75. Rimantas Vėbra, *Lietuvių Tautinis Atgimimas XIX Amžiuje* [The Lithuanian National Rebirth in the 19th Century] (Kaunas: Šviesa, 1992), 169.

76. Juozas Adomaitis-Šernas "Ko mums reikia?" [What do we need?], *Lietuviszkasis Balsas*, 12 (New York), 1885, 45.

77. "Už ką mes lenkams turime būti dėkingi arba nedėkingi" [What We Should be Grateful or Ungrateful for to the Poles], *Varpas*, 1 January 1892, 1.

78. *Ibid.*

79. *Ibid.*, 2.

80. Petras Matulaitis [pseud. Paulius], "Istorija Lietuvių krutėjimo paskutiniame dešimtmetyje Maskolijos ir Prūsų Lietuvoj" [The History of the Lithuanian Awakening During the Last Decade in Muscovite and Prussian Lithuania], *Varpas*, 6 September 1893, 81.

81. *Ibid.*

82. An archaic term that refers to the Lithuanians of East Prussia.

83. *Ibid.*, 82.

84. *Ibid.*, 83.

85. *Ibid.*

86. *Ibid.*, 87.

87. Jonas Staugaitis [pseud. Jonas Vincaitis], "Algirdas ir Keistutis didžius Lietuvos kunigaikščiu" [Algirdas and Keistutis the Grand Dukes of Lithuania], *Varpas*, 2-10, January–October 1889. Józef Wolff, *Kniazowie litewsko-ruscy od konca czternastego wieku* [Lithuanian-Rusin Princes from the End of the 14th Century] (Warsaw: Gebethner i Wolff, 1895). Kazimierz Stadnicki, *Synowie Gedymina wielkowladcy Litwy: Monwid, Narymunt, Jewnuta, Koriat* [The Sons of Gediminas, the Great Rulers of Lithuania] (Lwów: Nakł. Ignacy Stadnicki, 1881).

88. Gabrielius Landsbergis [pseud. Žemkalnis], *Lenkai ir Lietuviai: nuo 1228 m. iki 1430 m* [Poles and Lithuanians: From 1228 to 1430] (Chicago: Lietuvos, 1899). The Landsbergis family is descended from the Polonized Lithuanian szlachta. After World War I Gabrielius's son Vytautas became an activist for Lithuanian independence and a famous architect. Gabrielius's grandson Vytautas Landsbergis became the head of the newly independent Lithuania in 1990.

89. *Ibid.*, 4. Although chroniclers like Długosz disliked the Lithuanians, Landsbergis found passages where Długosz praised the Lithuanians. Most of Landsbergis's work is based on Michał Bobrzyński's *Dzieje Polski* (Warsaw: 1887) and Józef Szujski's *Historia Polski* (Warsaw: 1887).

90. Besides being a historian, Bobrzyński had a varied political career as one of the leaders of the Cracow conservatives.

91. Jonas Jablonskis [pseud. P. Vaidilas], "Devintas Rusijos archeologų kongresas" [The Ninth Russian Archeological Congress], *Varpas*, 9 September 1893, 137.

92. Vincas Pietaris [pseud. Vanagas], "Mythologiae Lituanicae Monumenta," *Varpas*, 1 January 1894, 11.

93. Aleksander Brückner, *Starożytna Litwa: Ludy i Bogi* [Ancient Lithuania: People and Gods] (Warsaw: Kowalewski, 1904), 7. He believed that because Lithuania had not contributed to world culture, it was not worth studying. See "Polacy a Litwini; język i literatura," [Poles and Lithuanians; Language and Literature] in *Polska i Litwa w dziejowym stosunku* (Warsaw: Gebethner, 1914), 343-392.

94. Pranas Mašiotas [pseud. P. A.?), "Tautiškas klausymas ir litvomanija" [The National Question and Lithomanianism], *Varpas*, 11 November 1892, 150.

95. Jonas Vileišis [pseud. Berželis], "Darbas legališkas ir revoliucijinis" [Legal and Revolutionary Work], *Varpas*, 3 March 1901, 25.

96. Povilas Višinskis [pseud. Blinda], "Kilk ir Kelk" [Raise and Lift], *Varpas*, 5 May 1901, 50.

97. Kudirka, *Raštai*, vol. 2, 278.

98. Several newspapers have had the name *Draugas* [Friend]. Kapsukas's *Draugas* ran from Tilsit from 1904-1905.

99. After the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union, Lithuanian Communists created a personality cult of Kapsukas, naming cities, streets and even the University of Vilnius after him.

100. Vincas Mickevičius [pseud. Revoliucionierius], "Revoliucinis Rusijos Judėjimas" [The Russian Revolutionary Movement], *Draugas*, 1-2 (Bitėnai, East Prussia) May-August, 1904, in Vincas Kapsukas, *Raštai* [Writings], vol. 1 (Vilnius: Valstybinė Grožinės Literatūros Leidykla, 1960), 152-178.

101. Jonas Biliūnas [pseud. Jonas Gražys], *Iš mūsų praeities (1892-1896): Darbininko-vilniečio atsiminimai* [From Our Past 1892-1896: A Vilnius Worker's Memoirs] (Bitėnai: Jankus, 1903) in J. Biliūnas, *Raštai* [Writings], vol. 2 (Vilnius: Valstybinė Grožinės Literatūros Leidykla, 1955), 253-270.

102. Jonas Biliūnas, "Užmužimas Caro Aleksandro II" [The Murder of Tsar Alexander II], in *Ibid.*, 271-297.

103. Biliūnas, *Iš mūsų praeities (1892-1896)*, in *Raštai*, vol. 2, 266.

IX CONCLUSION

...the same studies which have served for this work might easily, in other hands, not only receive a wholly different treatment and application but lead also to essentially different conclusions.

JACOB BURCKHARDT

In 1904, the University of Fribourg awarded a doctorate to Jonas Totoraitis (1872-1941) for his dissertation *Die Litauer unter dem Könige Mindowe bis zum Jahre 1263*. The first professionally trained historian since Daukantas, Totoraitis belonged to a different generation of Lithuanians. More of a scholar than a political activist, he was one of the founders of the Lithuanian Learned Society. Although deferential to people like Basanavičius, Totoraitis represented the start of a new era in Lithuanian historiography. The professional historians might have the same biases as their amateurish forefathers, but they did original research, used documents critically, and in general had to live up to Western European academic standards.

The same year that Totoraitis received his doctorate also saw the lifting of the press ban. Overall Russification had not worked.¹ It was not a well-thought-out or consistently implemented plan but a reaction to the insurrections. With the press ban the Russians had hoped to drive a wedge between the Poles and the Lithuanians, but if anything, the press ban forced Lithuanians to read Polish. Russification complemented Polonization in denationalizing Lithuanians. The two unsuccessful insurrections had weakened the Polonized szlachta's influence in Lithuania, but the press ban strengthened the Catholic clergy's influence. Whereas the peasantry might not learn the Polish or Russian languages, the Lithuanian elites remained under Polish influences.

Several factors shaped the development of Lithuanian historiography during the period of this study. First, the closing of the University of Vilnius in 1832 inhibited the professionalization of a group of native historians. Although the university was a Polish intellectual

stronghold, the researching of Lithuania's past could have been done only in Vilnius. Neither Königsberg nor St. Petersburg nor any university in the Congress kingdom produced the caliber of historians as Vilnius-historians such as Lelewel, Daniłowicz, Onacewicz, Jaroszewicz, and Daukantas. Without rigorous formal training those who wrote about history were left to their own devices, meaning that imagination and nationalist sentiments would often precede good scholarship.

The students and faculty of the University of Vilnius were among the first to take an interest in Lithuania's past. Many of them were also in the forefront of a burgeoning Polish national movement. The closing of the university was a disaster for Polish and Lithuanian scholarship, but from a nationalist point of view it had a liberating effect on the writing of history. The closing of the university left the writing of Lithuanian history to the untrained. Although University regulations prohibited the peasantry from attending, clever Lithuanian peasants like Daukantas could circumvent the system and matriculate at the University of Vilnius. But Valančius and Daukantas were exceptions rather than the rule. Indeed, Daukantas survived the best that Polish culture and academia had to offer and emerged as a Lithuanian nationalist, with all the weaknesses that nationalist historiography embodies. In other words, without Polish professors the new Lithuanian intelligentsia of the late nineteenth century could freely reinterpret Lithuania's history according to the demands of their national biases rather than having to work under the constraints of dispassionate scholarship.

Romantic nationalism encouraged a free interpretation of history. As influential as it was in Vilnius, Romanticism was never monolithic. A more critical school of historiography existed within Romantic nationalism. Joachim Lelewel, Ignacy Daniłowicz, Józef Jaroszewicz, and Motiejus Valančius represented a more scientific group of historians who had a critical attitude toward their sources and Lithuania's history. Among Lithuanian historians today there is a simple division between the scientific historians best represented by Lelewel and the romantic historians represented by Daukantas. I find this division neither precise nor acceptable. Lelewel wanted to foster a love of Poland as much as Daukantas wanted to foster a love of

Lithuania. Their Romanticism did not differ, their priorities as historians did.

Because Lithuanians had no professionally trained historians other than Simonas Daukantas, much of the historiography created in the nineteenth century was in the hands of dilettantes who were unsystematic or unscientific in their research. Often late nineteenth century Lithuanian activists merely compiled histories written by foreigners. Lithuanian history had very little to do with a critical approach to the historical record. It had a great deal to do with taking whatever the intelligentsia already knew about Lithuania and interpreting it, at times distorting it, to suit the needs of the Lithuanian activists. History in general and Lithuanian history in particular "has the good luck (or bad) luck to be practicable by amateurs. In fact, it needs popularizers."²

Despite the lip service that the Lithuanian intelligentsia paid to the peasantry, the activists of the Lithuanian national rebirth created an elite culture. Oral tradition and legend could not create a historical consciousness that nationalists could use. History could mix freely with myth and legend but the intelligentsia wanted a history that at least pretended to be factual. Because nineteenth-century Lithuanian activists produced such poorly researched and poorly written histories, many twentieth-century Lithuanian historians interested in historiography have not taken seriously those writers who promoted "Lithuanianism." Research and a critical approach to history may impede the development of a national consciousness.

Through the idealization and popularization of Lithuania's past, a small group of Lithuanian activists had developed a historical consciousness by the late nineteenth century. But they did not create a history *ex nihilo*. Histories written in Polish influenced Lithuanian historiography the most. Without their own historians the Lithuanian activists of the nineteenth century developed a culture of translation whereby the Lithuanians edited and then translated usually Polish works into the Lithuanian language. The Lithuanian activists used, reacted against, distorted, and selected the sources that would help them in their national struggle.

Living under Russian rule, the Lithuanians did not have their own state infrastructure for the cultivation of nationalism. Nevertheless, the Lithuanians created an illegal infrastructure of underground schools,

book smugglers, and an illegal press. History laid the groundwork for an intellectual infrastructure—a *mentalité*. Although none of these in themselves created a nation, they contributed to making Lithuania one of the most literate areas in the Russian empire.³ Literacy helped the intelligentsia of the Lithuanian national rebirth to advance “Lithuanianism.”

With the growth of secularization and nationalism, language began to replace the older forms of identity such as religion and region. On the one hand, the Lithuanian nationalists believed that the fight for their language was a fight for Lithuania’s survival. On the other hand, the Lithuanian szlachta did not see language as a criterion for national identity and called themselves Lithuanians in the Polish language. Yet, that same szlachta maintained a civic loyalty to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, but most likely this Duchy would be part of a federalist Poland. As Polonized as the Lithuanian szlachta were, they were the first to notice the gradual decline in the use of the Lithuanian language and the gradual disappearance of the native culture. But “Lithuanianism” was an academic exercise, a hobby, an avocation, that provided them with an original culture different from Poland’s. For the szlachta “Lithuanianism” was not a matter of national survival. They had a nation—Poland. In contrast to the szlachta, the Lithuanian intelligentsia of the late nineteenth century considered language as the marker that defined nationality.

The problem with Lithuania was that there were several different ways to understand who a Lithuanian was. There were two Lithuanias: one of the peasants, who spoke Lithuanian but who had almost no notion of nationality; the other of the szlachta, who had an older notion of nationality based on their membership in the noble estate. These two Lithuanias existed side by side but did not socially interact.⁴ After the freeing of the serfs in 1861, a very small group of peasant children emerged from their isolated rural existence and began to separate themselves from the agricultural population through education. This new Lithuanian intelligentsia began to struggle with the Polonized szlachta for leadership of the peasantry. The insurrections forced the szlachta to deal with the Lithuanian peasants in political terms rather than purely economic terms because they needed the peasantry’s support against the Tsar.⁵ The Lithuanian intelligentsia, however, needed the peasantry in the cultural struggle against the

Poles. The outcome of the competition was the ultimate victory of the intelligentsia, with the creation of a Lithuanian national identity, a new national consciousness, and the foundation for the nationhood achieved in 1918. One contemporary summed it up: "The Lithuanian national rebirth caused peasants and intellectuals to unite culturally in creating a national individuality."⁶ To be sure most peasants had a very limited knowledge of Lithuanian history and its meaning for them was insignificant.

Nineteenth- and twentieth-century commentators gave the Lithuanian language primacy in the development of "Lithuanianism," however, the issue was never the use of Lithuanian as a spoken language. Especially in border areas where Lithuanians lived alongside Slavs, the Lithuanians easily assimilated to Slavic culture. Peasants, the intelligentsia, and even the old Samogitian szlachta would use German, Russian, Polish, or Lithuanian as the situation required. The question was whether Lithuanian would be used as a literary language. Although Protestants and Catholics fostered the use of written Lithuanian as early as the sixteenth century, only nationalists would claim that they had a Lithuanian national identity. The historian Daukantas wrote the first secular and consciously nationalistic book in the Lithuanian language. Daukantas and the small group of linguistic Lithuanians who attended the University of Vilnius did not constitute a nation. But eventually Lithuanian nationalism grew out of their sense of national identity. The difference between the participants in the Lithuanistics movement and the Polonized szlachta was not so much their language, which usually was Polish, but rather their attitude toward what Poška considered a correct view of Lithuania's history.

The Lithuanian intelligentsia had to differentiate and separate itself not only from their unlettered rural relatives but from the Polonized szlachta as well. Besides creating the illegal schools and an illegal press, the intelligentsia needed to create an ideological justification for their separation from the Poles. Education set apart the intelligentsia as leaders of the peasantry, whereas the intelligentsia's imagined past provided the impetus to resist Polonization.

In the early nineteenth century, oblivion threatened the Lithuanian language. Polonization even started to affect the remote village, luring socially ambitious peasants whose national consciousness was

weak or nonexistent to take the path of least resistance. If they aspired to rise above their class, they naturally would adopt the Polish language.⁷ For all the nationalists' wishful theorizing about the peasantry being the guardians of the nation's spirit, in reality the peasantry guarded nothing deliberately. Upwardly mobile Lithuanians had no reason to retain their native language. Learning Polish had social and cultural advantages, while learning Russian had certain legal advantages. Thus, the very nature of Lithuanian national identity depended on a conscious attempt to resist denationalization. Some of the Lithuanian intelligentsia deliberately chose to speak and "feel" Lithuanian even when that might be socially disadvantageous.

For the more prosperous peasantry who had ambitions of having their sons and daughters rise in social class, the choice of speaking Lithuanian became a conscious one. The *Varpininkai* believed the Lithuanian peasant and even the Polonized Lithuanian szlachta could consciously decide to use the Lithuanian language even when one was part of the elite classes. Because the Lithuanian szlachta did not speak Lithuanian, "Lithuanianism" became associated with the Lithuanian intelligentsia who wanted to purge Lithuania and Lithuanians of foreign influences.

The works of Daukantas and the periodicals *Auszra* and *Varpas* had a limited audience. In a sense the intelligentsia wanted to widen their reading audience by educating the Lithuanian peasant. The Lithuanian intelligentsia also defined who was a Lithuanian. Their interpretation of Lithuanian history excluded those elements which they perceived as being Polish. Among the linguistic Lithuanians, history was a source of identity only for the intelligentsia. Nevertheless, because the Lithuanian intelligentsia came from the peasantry and had closer ties to it than the Polonized szlachta, they were the natural leaders of the peasantry. The nationally conscious clergy wanted to contest that leadership but the clergy was in fact a division of that same intelligentsia.

Initially, the antagonism between the Polonized Lithuanian szlachta and the Lithuanian intelligentsia was an internecine feud about who would lead the Lithuanian masses. After the Lithuanian szlachta had lost in the two nineteenth-century insurrections, they surrendered their leadership to the new Lithuanian intelligentsia. The Lithuanian szlachta who continued to use the Polish language began

to identify with Poland rather than Lithuania. Even into the post-World War II era there remained a group of Poles who expressed a type of sentiment for the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.⁸ But these Poles were only historic Lithuanians, not modern ethnic Lithuanians.

Partly because the Vilnius question of the inter-war period generated so much antagonism between Lithuanians and Poles, the issue of nineteenth-century Polish-Lithuanian cultural relations, while never ignored by Lithuanian or Polish scholars, has poisoned attempts to make a close connection between Polish and Lithuanian culture. On the one hand, Lithuanians need to cut the apron strings of Polish influences. On the other hand, Poles need to explain what went wrong. Why did the Lithuanian intelligentsia react so strongly against the Polonized szlachta? The Poles were not the most malevolent "oppressors." Although the Church became a vehicle for Polonization, in general Polonization was not coercive. The Poles inevitably labeled Lithuanian nationalists as "Lithomanians." Poles perceived the "Lithomanians" as traitors in the struggle against Tsarist oppression. In response, the activists of the Lithuanian national rebirth had to be aggressive nationalists. They had to create a nation where none existed before.⁹ Maintaining the status quo meant Polonization. The scholar Michał Römer blamed the Poles for not understanding the national aspirations of the Lithuanians. I would argue that the Poles understood the consequences of Lithuanian nationalism. Lithuanian independence meant the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth would not rise again.

History created a community that could transcend time, place, and even language. It made little difference if they had distorted that history. What mattered most for the Lithuanian activists was raising the national consciousness of a people. The Lithuanian intelligentsia used history as a pedagogic tool to illustrate what "Lithuanianism" meant. It was also used to polemicize with the Poles. The Lithuanian language was the medium of the Lithuanian national rebirth, but Lithuanians found the message of "Lithuanianism" in history and its related disciplines. "Lithuanianism" existed through language and culture. The nineteenth-century activists found their culture in history. To be sure, Lithuania was a peasant nation. But as the Lithuanians proceeded to develop a sense of their national identity, a peasant culture proved inadequate. History gave Lithuanians an elite culture

and the idea that they could reestablish a state that had been large in the Middle Ages and could possibly rise again.

The growth of Lithuanian nationalism, like all nationalisms, remains unique because it fits only some of the suppositions of Western scholars like Hobsbawm or Anderson. The Lithuanian experience validates some of Benedict Anderson's concepts about literacy as a factor in creating national consciousness.¹⁰ *Auszra* and *Varpas* definitely advanced "Lithuanianism." But they were illegal publications competing with the legal Polish and Russian press. The Lithuanian intelligentsia created a historical consciousness without an army, a bureaucracy, public education, commemorative ceremonies or public monuments.¹¹ The activists of the Lithuanian national rebirth in effect created a historical consciousness without a state. Underground schools, an illegal press and book smugglers are no substitutes for a state apparatus.

More than socioeconomic or intellectual factors, Lithuania's geographic position, World War I, and the Russian Revolution allowed for the creation of the modern Lithuanian state in 1918. Only after 1918 could the Lithuanian intelligentsia inculcate the masses with their notion of "Lithuanianism." Before 1918, the Lithuanian nation consisted of disparate elements: an apathetic peasantry, a very small nationally conscious intelligentsia, and a szlachta that increasingly began to see itself as Polish rather than Lithuanian. Small and belated, a long time in the making, the product of much historical myth-making, the Lithuanian national rebirth nevertheless laid the foundation upon which modern Lithuania stands.

NOTES

1. Weeks, *Nation and State in Late Imperial Russia*, 5.
2. Jacques Le Goff, *History and Memory*, trans. Steven Rendall and Elizabeth Claman (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992), 129.
3. Thaden, *Russia's Western Borderlands, 1710-1870*, 240.
4. Lukšienė, *Demokratinė ugdymo mintis Lietuvoje*, 11.
5. Maciūnas, *Lituanistinis Sąjūdis*, 81.
6. Stasys Šalkauskis, "Pirmosios Atžalos" [The First Greening], *Romuva*, 1 (April, 1921): 21.
7. Roman Szporluk states the case in his *Communism and Nationalism: Karl Marx versus Friedrich List* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 156. "...peasants speaking folk dialects would advance to a higher civilization by becoming literate in one of the already existing developed languages and by identifying with one of these political nations, not by creating new nations on the basis of village dialects or distant and vague historical legends."
8. After World War II, the Academic Community of Wilno University of Stefan Batory continued to do research in Lithuanian history. Based in London, this émigré group published *Alma Mater Vilnensis*, 1949-1958.
9. Ernest Gellner's statement that, "Nationalism is not the awakening of nations to self-consciousness: it invents nations where they do not exist...." seems appropriate here. See *Thought and Change* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), 168.
10. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 2nd ed. (New York: Verso, 1993), 44.
11. Eric Hobsbawm's contention that these five institutions are relevant for the creation of national feeling were absent from nineteenth century Lithuania. This partly explains why the Lithuanian national movement did not extend beyond the intelligentsia. See Eric Hobsbawm, "'Introduction: Inventing Traditions', and 'Mass-Producing Traditions: Europe, 1870-1914,'" in *The Invention of Tradition*, Eric Hobsbawm and Terrence Ranger, eds. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

BIBLIOGRAPHIC ESSAY

Works on Lithuania's historiography already exist,¹ but none incorporate the term historicism to explain the amateur historian's attempt to create a national history. Earlier studies include the historiography of the Grand Duchy or Lithuania, which means that they are the historiography of a state. The main focus of this study, however, deals with those histories written in the Lithuanian language during the nineteenth century. The amateur historians who wrote their histories in Lithuanian had some sense of being Lithuanian. Earlier Polish-Lithuanian historians and chroniclers might call themselves Lithuanians but they did not mean the same thing as those who had a sense of "Lithuanianism."²

A twenty-page article by Zenonas Ivinskis entitled "Lietuvos istorija romantizmo metu ir dabar" [Lithuanian History during the Romanticism Period and Now]³ most closely parallels my study, though his article amounts to a mere outline of the subject. Ivinskis included the amateur scholars of the Lithuanian national rebirth in his survey as well as non-Lithuanian historians. He, however, took no interest in the issue of history as a source of national identity which sets off his pioneering work from the present study.

The first scholarly study of the Lithuanian national rebirth was Michał Römer's highly respected *Litwa. Studium o odrodzeniu narodu litewskiego* [Lithuania: A Study about the Lithuanian National Rebirth].⁴ In periodizing the Lithuanian national rebirth, Römer addressed two questions: When did the Lithuanian national rebirth start? When did a clear national identity first appear? Though he admitted there had been an earlier rebirth, Römer dated the start of modern Lithuania with the appearance of the illegal newspaper *Auszra*. Römer also addressed the origins of Polish-Lithuanian tensions. He blamed the Poles for misunderstanding the national aspirations of the Lithuanians.⁵ Although Römer wrote about the formation of a historical-cultural concept as an aspect of the Lithuanian national rebirth, he was not interested in the role of historiography in the creation of that rebirth.

The modern Polish historian Jerzy Ochmański in his work *Litewski ruch narodowo-kulturalny w XIX wieku (do 1890)* in many ways reflects a traditional Lithuanian view of the Lithuanian national rebirth. Again much like Römer, Ochmański addressed the issue of national identity and nationalism and like Römer, did not deal directly with nineteenth-century historiography. Römer and Ochmański acknowledge that a Lithuanian identity had existed long before the nineteenth century, perhaps as far back as the Middle Ages.⁶ Yet Ochmański maintained that the szlachta's regional identity differed from modern nationalism.⁷ Among other Polish historians who have written about the Lithuanian national rebirth is Piotr Łossowski in his *Po tej i tamtej stronie Niemna: Stosunki polsko-litewskie 1883-1939* [On This and That Side of the Nieman: Polish-Lithuanian Relations 1883-1939], including his article about the newspaper *Ausra*.⁸ Unlike the pro-Lithuanian Römer and Ochmański, Łossowski usually maintains a neutral position regarding Lithuanian issues. Nevertheless, he occasionally lends his name to tendentious anti-Lithuanian rhetoric.⁹ Other than the Lithuanians themselves, Polish historians have written the most about the Lithuanian national rebirth, but their works are scattered throughout books and journals that directly or indirectly deal with Lithuania. No Polish work exists that deals solely with Lithuanian historiography.

In 1939 Vincas Maciūnas published his seminal doctoral thesis entitled *Lituanistinis sąjūdis XIX amžiaus pradžioje* [The Lithuanistics Movement at the Beginning of the 19th Century]. The Lithuanistics¹⁰ movement included a plethora of writers who in varying degrees had a sense of Lithuanianness. They were a mixed group of amateurs who often but not always wrote in Polish and dabbled in different disciplines such as the history of literature, archeology, folklore, mythology, poetry and related fields. Many of the participants in the Lithuanistics movement wrote before the appearance of *Ausra*. Some were contemporaries of Daukantas. The Lithuanistics movement made Lithuanian history the domain of both dilettantes and the scholars of the University of Vilnius. By making the Lithuanian national rebirth into a literary movement composed of several hundred elite writers, Vincas Maciūnas pushed its beginnings back to the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.¹¹ Maciūnas also stressed the interrelation

of the social, political, and linguistic elements in Polish-Lithuanian relations. Maciūnas asserted that to understand the Lithuanistics movement, one had to study Lithuanian culture in conjunction with Polish culture. In other words, Maciūnas believed that the same forces that affected the growth of Polish nationalism also influenced Lithuania. The Lithuanians suffered from the partitions as much as the Poles.¹² Because Maciūnas did not go beyond the Lithuanistics movement, he did not deal with late nineteenth-century historiography.

Although Maciūnas was not a Marxist, his analysis of early nineteenth-century Lithuanian literature is compatible with the Marxist historian Miroslav Hroch's concept of the Lithuanian national rebirth. Hroch labeled Lithuania's national development "belated." In his concept of phases of national development, he characterized the first phase as a small group of activists who do not have close ties with the masses. Only later with the appearance of *Auszra* in 1883 do we have a second phase, a period of patriotic agitation.¹³ Parallels exist between nineteenth-century Lithuanian historiography and Hroch's model. Primarily because ethnic Lithuanians formed a peasant nation, the Lithuanians did not have opportunities for education or the development of a bourgeoisie. If modernization begets nationalism as some historians have stated,¹⁴ then Lithuanians should not have developed a movement that eventually would become nationalist. In many ways the proposition that Miroslav Hroch presented has a parallel in Lithuanian historiography. If Lithuanian nationalism was belated, then the professionalization of Lithuanian historiography and the development of a historical consciousness were belated as well. Although peasants have oral traditions, they cannot produce a literate historiography. But more importantly Lithuanian historiography developed belatedly because the Russian authorities closed the University of Vilnius and imposed a press ban.

Lithuanian authors writing during the Soviet period usually explained the Lithuanian national rebirth in terms of the Lithuanian peasantry's fight against the economic oppression of the Poles. If one uses Soviet terminology, then the partitioning powers and the dominant social classes, i.e., the Polish szlachta, were the oppressors. As a reflection of Soviet intellectual history, Bronius Genzelis's *Švietėjai ir Jų Idėjos Lietuvoje (XIX a.)* [Enlighteners and Their Ideas (19th

Century)) is a good history of the Lithuanian rebirth. Similar to Hroch, Genzelis wrote that the Lithuanian national rebirth had its early Polish phase and its later Lithuanian phase.¹⁵ But whereas Hroch presented a useful Marxist model, Genzelis fell victim to Soviet simplifications.

Egidijus Aleksandravičius and Antanas Kulakauskas wrote the most intriguing book to appear recently.¹⁶ It deals with a host of nineteenth-century Lithuania political, social, and cultural issues. In a chapter entitled "XIX Amžiaus Tyrinėjimų Apžvalga," [A Survey of Research on the 19th Century] the authors examine trends in the historiography of the Lithuanian national rebirth. Like Ivinskis they do not tie national identity to Lithuanian historiography, and yet they approach the subject more closely than Ivinskis and often take a revisionist view of Polish-Lithuanian relations. For example, they call for the rehabilitation of the Polonized Lithuanian szlachta in Lithuanian history.¹⁷ For Aleksandravičius and Kulakauskas, Lithuanian historians have written off too quickly the history of the Lithuanian szlachta as Polish history. While not trying to make Poles into Lithuanians, the authors see the symbiotic relationship between the two cultures. Because of Polish-Lithuanian antagonisms that culminated in the Vilnius question of the inter-war period, too often Lithuanian and Polish historians have stressed the differences between Polish and Lithuanian cultures. Modern Lithuanian nationalists may want to project their biases onto nineteenth-century Lithuania and show that Lithuania and Poland did not have a common heritage, but the younger generation of Lithuanian historians does not seem to be held hostage to the Vilnius question as much as their fathers were. What Römer did in 1908 with his *Litwa*, Aleksandravičius and Kulakauskas are doing in 1996. Their unwieldy and impressionistic style makes their book more contemporary, which is both its weakness and strength. In analyzing the history of nineteenth-century Lithuania, they also provide insights into the history of Polish culture in this region.

Aleksandravičius's and Kulakauskas's teacher and, arguably, the most productive historian of the Lithuanian national rebirth is Vytautas Merkys. Unfortunately, Merkys wrote most of his works under the Soviet occupation. Many of his contemporaries presented the Lithuanian national rebirth, national identity, and nationalism

simply as a bourgeois phenomena. Merkys tried to avoid Soviet simplifications as best as he could. More sophisticated and scholarly than most of the historians of the Soviet period, he was nevertheless hampered by Soviet political constraints, Marxist jargon, and a stereotypical class approach to the Lithuanian national rebirth.

Since 1990 a group of young Lithuanian historians and linguists have published *Lietuvių Atgimimo Istorijos Studijos* [Studies in the History of the Lithuanian Rebirth]. The contributors to this series of books have changed with the appearance of each volume but the core of editors has remained the same.¹⁸ So far fourteen volumes have appeared. Volumes one, four and eight deal directly with issues of national identity.¹⁹ Other volumes deal with individuals like Daukantas or with themes like the role of the Catholic Church in the Lithuanian national rebirth.²⁰ Possibly because none of the Lithuanian rebirth activists, other than Daukantas, were historians, no volume deals directly with nineteenth-century Lithuanian historiography. One must glean Lithuanian historiography from diverse articles. Other volumes go beyond the parameters of this study. Nevertheless, the series *Studies in the History of the Lithuanian Rebirth* presents the most varied and in-depth collection of articles and books on subjects related to the Lithuanian national rebirth. The *Studies* have copies of primary sources, reviews of books, and original articles by Lithuanian and American scholars. Although the reader can still find some articles with slow-to-die Soviet jargon about the class struggle, the main purpose of the *Studies* is a deliberate attempt to publish volumes free of Soviet ideology. The appearance of volume one coincided with Lithuania's declaration of independence in 1990.

Immigrant historians have contributed to Lithuanian historiography unevenly. Because the Soviets cut them off from primary sources, the immigrant historians often resorted to writing nationalist propaganda. However, because Soviet censorship did not hamper the immigrant historian, the immigrant became the only scholar able to express himself freely. As a starting point for research, the thirty-six volume *Lietuvių Enciklopedija*²¹ and its English companion *Encyclopedia Lituanica*²² are the most useful sources for the study of virtually any topic of Lithuanian history.²³ Notwithstanding that both are Lithuanian immigrant creations and that encyclopedias usually are tertiary

sources, the best Lithuanian authors contributed signed original articles with bibliographic references. Of course, the articles remain scattered and even the articles on Lithuanian historiography merely survey the subject.

Perhaps the most interesting Lithuanian-American historian is Vincas Trumpa. Although exile has cut Trumpa off from Lithuanian sources for much of his productive career, he has contributed to the encyclopedias and a host of Lithuanian-American publications. Among Lithuanian-trained émigré historians, Trumpa stands out as an original thinker who has conceptualized trends in Lithuanian historiography. As an émigré, Trumpa could write without Soviet or Romantic nationalist biases. Using well-known printed sources, Trumpa has challenged the simplistic labels of "romantic," and "scientific" history. In a collection of essays,²⁴ Trumpa tries to establish a model for nineteenth-century Lithuanian history. His model does not differ substantially from a Polish interpretation in which Lithuania was a province of Poland. Trumpa argues that after the Union of Lublin, Lithuania became a province of Poland and that what occurred in 1918 was the creation of the Lithuanian intelligentsia who invented a new nation that had very little in common with the old Grand Duchy of Lithuania.²⁵ Although the editors and writers of the illegal newspaper *Varpas* had proposed this idea in the nineteenth century, and therefore Trumpa's view is not original, he is the first historian to suggest that Lithuanian historiography had a realistic school. Where the romantic school of Lithuanian historiography has maintained that Lithuanian history represented an unbroken thread from its prehistory to the present, Trumpa believes the opposite. The younger generation of Lithuanian historians have at different times embraced and rejected Trumpa's revisionism. Nevertheless, Trumpa gives Polish culture its place in Lithuanian historiography.

In spite of these differences among Lithuanian historians, the two salient features throughout Lithuanian historiography are its Romanticism and anti-Polish character.

NOTES

1. Zenonas Ivinskis, "Ivadas" [Preface], in *Lietuvos Istorija: iki Vytauto Didžiojo Mirties* [Lithuania's History to Vytautas the Great's Death] (Rome: Lietuvių Katalikų Mokslo Akademija, 1978), 19-92. Ignas Jonynas, "Lietuvos istoriografija," in *Istorijos Baruose*, 99-188.
2. Lithuanians have given a variety of mystical meanings to the term "Lietuvybė." It means nothing more than a concern with being a Lithuanian. This concern intensifies when the Lithuanian language or culture seem in danger of disappearing.
3. Zenonas Ivinskis, "Lietuvos Istorija Romantizmo Metu ir Dabar" [Lithuanian History during the Period of Romanticism and Now], *L.K.M.A. Suvažiavimo Darbai*, 3 (Kaunas: Šviesos, 1940): 320-341.
4. Michał Römer, *Litwa. Studium o odrodzeniu narodu litewskiego* [Lithuania. A Study of the Lithuanian National Rebirth] (Lwów: Polskie Tow. Nakładowe, 1908).
5. *Ibid.*, 176. Although sympathetic to the Lithuanian national cause Römer's scholarship has earned the respect of Polish historians. Juliusz Bardach quoted in Egidijus Aleksandravičius, and Antanas Kulakauskas, *Carų valdžioje: Lietuva XIX amžiuje* [Under the Government of the Tsars: Lithuania in the 19th Century] (Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 1996), 30.
6. Jerzy Ochmański, "The National Idea in Lithuania from the 16th to the First Half of the 19th Century: The Problem of Cultural-Linguistic Differentiation," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 10 (1986): 300-315.
7. Ochmański, *Litewski ruch*, 45.
8. Piotr Łossowski, "Gazeta 'Ausra' i początek narodowego ruchu litewskiego (1883-1886)" [The Newspaper 'Ausra' and the Beginnings of the Lithuanian National Movement (1883-1886)], in *Studia z dziejów ZSRR i Europy Środkowej*, ed. Rafał Gerber, (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1965), 81-129.
9. He wrote the introduction to Konrad Górski's very biased anti-Lithuanian book, *Divide et Impera* (Białystok: Towarzystwo Literackie im. Adama Mickiewicza Oddział Białystocki, 1995).
10. Lithuanian studies. Chapter four dealt with the Lithuanistics movement.
11. Vincas Maciūnas, *Lituanistinis Sąjūdis XIX Amžiaus Pradžioje* (dissertation published Kaunas: Varpas, 1939), 298.
12. *Ibid.*, 79.
13. Miroslav Hroch, *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe: A Comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of Patriotic Groups among the Smaller European Nations*, trans. Ben Fawkes (Cambridge: University Press, 1985), 87.
14. Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992).
15. Bronius Genzelis, *Švietėjai ir Jų Idėjos Lietuvoje (XIX a.)* [Enlighteners and their Ideas in (19th century) Lithuania] (Vilnius: Mintis, 1972), 10.
16. Aleksandravičius and Kulakauskas, *Carų valdžioje*.
17. *Ibid.*, 237.
18. The most frequent editors of this series are: Egidijus Aleksandravičius, Antanas Kulakauskas, Česlovas Laurinavičius, Rimantas Miknys, Egidijus Motieka, Vladas Sirutavičius, Giedrius Subačius, and Antanas Tyla. Individual authors and editors come and go. Usually the authors congregate around the Institute of Lithuanian History.

19. Egidijus Aleksandravičius et al., eds., *Lietuvių Atgimimo Istorijos Studijos* [Studies in the History of the Lithuanian Rebirth] (Vilnius: Sietynas, 1990), vol. 1, *Tautinės saviminės žadintojai: nuo asmens iki partijos* [Awakeners of National Consciousness: From the Individual to the Party]. Egidijus Aleksandravičius et al., eds., *Liaudis virsta tauta* [The Folk becomes a Nation], vol. 4 (Vilnius: Baltoji Varnelė, 1993). Egidijus Motieka et al., eds., *Asmuo: tarp tautos ir valstybės* [The Individual: Between Nation and State], vol. 8 (Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopekijų leidykla, 1996).

20. Egidijus Motieka et al., eds., *Lietuvių Atgimimo Istorijos Studijos* (Vilnius: Viltis, 1993), vol. 5, *Simonas Daukantas*. Egidijus Motieka et al., eds., vol. 7, *Atgimimas ir Katalikų Bažnyčia* [The Rebirth and the Catholic Church] (Vilnius: Katalikų pasaulis, 1994).

21. Vaclovas Biržiška et al., eds., *Lietuvių Enciklopedija*, 37 vols. (Boston: Lietuvių Enciklopedijos Leidykla, 1953-1985).

22. Simas Sužiedėlis, ed., *Encyclopedia Lituanica* (Boston: Kapočius, 1972), s.v. "Historiography," by Pranas Skardžius. This is a valuable survey of Lithuania's historiography.

23. In contrast to the immigrant encyclopedias, the *Lietuviškoji Tarybinė Enciklopedija* [Soviet Lithuanian Encyclopedia] (Vilnius: Vyriausioji Enciklopedijų Redakcija, 1976-1985) is of no use for the study of Lithuanian historiography.

24. Vincas Trumpa, *Lietuva XIX-tame Amžiuje* [Lithuania in the 19th Century] (Chicago: Morkūno, 1989).

25. *Ibid.*, 46.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Baliński, Michał, and Timotej Lipinski. *Starożytna Polska pod względem historycznym, geograficznym i statystycznym opisana*. Vol. 4: *Wielkie Księztwo Litewskie* [The Grand Duchy of Lithuania]. Warsaw: Ogelbrand, 1886.
- Basanavičius, Jonas. *Baudžiava Lietuvoje* [Serfdom in Lithuania]. Vilnius: Kuktos, 1907.
- . *D-ro Jono Basanavičiaus autobiografija: Mano Gyvenimo Kronika ir Nervų Ligos Istorija 1851-1922* [Dr. Jonas Basanavičius's Autobiography: The Chronology of My Life and a History of Nervous Illness 1851-1922]. Vilnius: Lietuvių Mokslo Draugijos Leidiny, 1936.
- . *Lenkai Lietuvoje* [The Poles in Lithuania]. Translated from Russian by V. Gintautas [Petras Vileišis]. Chicago: Lietuvos, 1903.
- . *Apie Senovės Lietuvos Pylis* [About Lithuania's Ancient Castles]. Tilsit: Jankus, 1891.
- . *Grovo Kyburg'o Kelione Lietuvon 1397* [Graf Kyburg's Journey in Lithuania 1397]. Translation of Teodor Narbutt's *Pomniejsze pisma historyczne* [Minor Historical Writings]. Vilnius: 1856. Plymouth Pa.: Vienybė Lietuvninkų, 1900.
- . *Iš Krikščionijos Santykių su Senovės Lietuvių Tikyba ir Kultūra* [From Christian Relations with Ancient Lithuania's Religion and Culture]. Vilnius: Kuktos, 1912.
- . *Rinkiniai Raštai* [Selected Writings]. Vilnius: Vaga, 1970.
- Basanavicius, Jonas. *Lietuvizkai Trakiskos Studijos* [Lithuanian Thracian Studies]. Shenandoah, Pa.: Dirva, 1898.
- Biliūnas, Jonas. *Raštai* [Writings]. Vol. 2. Vilnius: Valstybinė Grožinės Literatūros Leidykla, 1955.
- Bohusz, Ksawier. *O początkach narodu i języka litewskiego* [About the Beginnings of the Lithuanian Nation and Language]. Warsaw: Gazeta Warszawska, 1808.
- Brückner, Aleksander. *Starożytna Litwa: Ludy i Bogi* [Ancient Lithuania: Peoples and Gods]. Warsaw: Kowalewski, 1904.

Burba, Aleksandras, and Jonas Szlupas. *Bestiality of The Russian Czardom toward Lithuania*. Baltimore: Lithuanian Society of Sciences and Arts, 1891.

Czacki, Tadeusz. *O litewskich i polskich prawach* [About Lithuanian and Polish Laws]. 2 vols. Warsaw: Rogacz, 1800-1801.

Daukantas, Simonas. *Raštai* [Writings]. Edited by Vytautas Merkys. 2 vols. Vilnius: Vaga, 1976.

_____. *Simono Daukanto raštai: Laiškai Teodorui Narbutui* [Simonas Daukantas's Writings: Letters to Teodor Narbutt]. Edited by Toleina Daržinskaitė. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1996.

_____. *Istorija Žemaitiška* [A Samogitian History]. Edited by Birutė Vanagienė. 2 vols. Vilnius: Vaga, 1995.

_____. *Vertimai ir Sekimai* [Translations and Goals]. Edited by Vytautas Merkys. Vilnius: Vaga, 1984.

Dauvksza, Mikaloiv. "Przedmowa do czytelnika łaskowego" [Preface to the Gracious Reader], in Jakub Wujek, *Postilla Catholica, Tai est: Iżguldymas Ewangeliu kiekwieno Nedelos ir Szwętes per wissus metus*, [Catholic Postil, that is, An Explanation of the Gospels for Every Sunday and Holyday Throughout the Year]. Trans. Mikaloiv Dauvksza, Vilnius: Akademios Societatis, 1599. Photograph by Kaunas: Lietuvos Universiteto leidiny, 1926.

Dembskis, Vladislovas. *Ar Vyskupas Valančius Nebuvo Viliugiu Lietuvystės?* [Was Bishop Valančius a Traitor to Lithuanianism?]. Chicago: Lietuvos, 1901.

Dusbugietis, Petras. *Prūsijos Žemės Kronika*. Translated and edited by K. Korsakas et al., from Petri von Dusburg. *Chronica Terrae Prussiae*. 13th century, Vilnius: Vaga, 1985.

Jaroszewicz, Józef. *Obraz Litwy pod względem jēj oświaty i cywilizacyi, od czasów najdawniejszych do końca wieku XVIII* [A Picture of Lithuania in Regards to Its Enlightenment and Civilization, from the Oldest Times to the End of the 18th Century]. 3 vols. Vilnius: Rafałowicz, 1844-1845.

- Jucewicz, Ludwik. *Litwa pod względem starożytnych zabytków, obyczajów i zwyczajów, skresłona przez Ludwika z Pokiewia* [Lithuania in Regards to its Ruins, Ceremonies and Attitudes toward Customs by Ludwik from Pokiew]. 3 vols. Vilnius: Rafałowicz, 1846.
- Jucevičius, Liudvikas. *Raštai* [Writings]. Translated and edited by D. Urbas, Vilnius: Valstybinės Grožinės Literatūros Leidykla, 1959.
- _____. *Mokytį Žemaičiai* [Learned Samogitians]. Translated and edited by K. Korsakas et al. Vilnius: Vaga, 1975.
- Kapsukas, Vincas. *Raštai* [Writings]. Vol. 1. Vilnius: Valstybinė Grožinės Literatūros Leidykla, 1960.
- Kieniewicz, Stefan, et al., eds. *Powstanie Styczniowe: Materiały i dokumenty* [The January Insurrection: Materials and Documents]. Part 4: *Prasa tajna z lat 1861-1864* [The Covert Press from 1861-1864]. Wrocław: Polska Akademia Nauk, 1970.
- Kirkor, Adam Honory [pseud. Jana se Sliwina]. *Przechadzki po Wilnie i jego okolicach* [Walks around Vilnius and Its Environs]. Vilnius: Orgelbranda, 1859.
- _____. *Lietuva nuo seniausių laikų iki 1882 metų* [Lithuania from Ancient Times to 1882]. Translated by from Russian by Vytautas Visockas. Edited by Perla Vikuvienė. Vilnius: Mintis, 1995.
- _____. *Kapai didzių kunigaikščių ir karalių Vilniuje* [The Graves of the Grand Dukes and Kings in Vilnius]. Translated from Polish by Petras Vileišis, Tilsit: Mauderodė, 1898.
- Kojelavičius, Vijūkas Albertas. *Lietuvos Istorija*. Translated by and edited by J. Lankutis et al., from *Historiae Lituanæ*. Danzig: 1650. Vilnius: Vaga, 1988.
- Kraszewski, Józef I. *Litwa za Witolda* [Lithuania under Vytautas]. Vilnius: Zawadzki, 1850.
- _____. *Wilno od początków jego do roku 1750* [Vilnius from its Beginnings to 1750]. 3 vols. Vilnius: Zawadzki, 1842.
- _____. *Anafiel: Pieśni z podań Litwy* [Anafiel: A Legendary Song] Vilnius: Zawadzki, 1846.

Kraszewski, Józef I. *Litwa: Starożytne dzieje, ustawy, język, wiara, obyczaje, pieśni, przysłowie, podania* [Lithuania: Ancient History, Laws, Language, Religion, Customs, Songs, Proverbs, and Publications]. Vol. 1: *Historia do XIII wieku* [History to the 13th Century]. Vol. 2: *Historia od początku XIII wieku, do roku 1386* [History from the Beginning of the 13th Century to 1386]. 2 vols. Warsaw: Strabski, 1847-1850.

_____. *Witolorauda*. Vilnius: Zawadski, 1846.

Krömer, Marcin. *Kronika Polska*. 30 vols. Cracow: Loba 1611. 2nd ed. by Sanok: Pollak, 1857.

Kubilius, Jonas, et al., eds. *Lietuvių Kultūros Veikėjų Laiškai J. I. Kraševskiui* [The Letters of Lithuanian Cultural Activists to J. I. Kraszewski]. Vilnius: Mokslas, 1992.

Kudirka, Vincas. *Vinco Kudirkos Raštai* [The Writings of Vincas Kudirka]. 6 vols. Edited by Juozas Gabrys. Tilsit: Mauderode, 1909.

_____. *Raštai* [Writings]. 2 vols. Edited by J. Lankutis et al. Vilnius: Vaga, 1989.

Landsbergis, Gabrielius [pseud. Žemkalnis]. *Lenkai ir Lietuviai: nuo 1228 m. iki 1430* [Poles and Lithuanians: from 1228 to 1430]. Chicago: Lietuvos, 1899.

Latvis, Henriks, and Hermanas Vartebergē. *Livonijos Kronka*. Translated by Juozas Jurginis from *Heinrici Chronicon Lyvoniae*. 13th century. Vilnius: Mokslo, 1991.

Lietuvos Metraštis [The Lithuanian Chronicle]. Translated by Rimantas Jasas and edited by K. Korsakas et al. Vilnius: Vaga, 1971.

Lelewel, Joachim. *Dzieje Litwy i Rusi. Aż do unji z Polską w Lublinie 1569 zawartej* [The History of Lithuania and Rus'. Up to the Conclusion of the Union with Poland in Lublin in 1569]. 2nd ed. Poznań: Stefanski, 1844.

_____. *Historyka*. Warsaw: Dąbrowski, 1862.

_____. *Jakim ma być historyk* [How to be a Historian]. Vilnius: Marcinowski, 1815.

_____. *Wzmianka o najdawniejszych dzieiopisach polskich, i uwagi nad rosprawa Ksawera Bohusz: O początku narodu i języka litewskiego* [About the Mention of the Oldest Polish Historiography, and Attention to a Discussion of Ksawer Bohusz's: About the Beginnings of the Lithuanian Nation and Language]. Warsaw: Dąbrowski 1809.

- Maironis, Jonas. *Maironis Raštai* [Maironis's Writings]. Vol. 3, edited by Justinas Marcinkevičius, Vitas Areška, and Vanda Zaboskaitė. Vilnius: Vaga, 1992.
- Mickiewicz, Adam. *Pan Tadeusz*. Warsaw: Czytelnik, 1991.
- . *The Book of Our Pilgrimage*. Translated by J. K. Tautmyla. Chicago: Draugas Press, 1976.
- Narbutt, Teodor. *Dzieje narodu litewskiego* [The History of the Lithuanian Nation]. 9 vols. Vilnius: Marcinowski, 1835.
- . *Dzieje starożytne narodu Litewskiego* [The Ancient History of the Lithuanian Nation]. Vilnius: Marcinowski, 1835.
- Naruszewicz, Adam. *Historja narodu polskiego od początku chrześcijaństwa. Panowanie Piastów* [The History of the Polish Nation from the Beginning of Christianity. The Reign of the Piasts]. 7 vols. Warsaw: Grollowska, 1780-1786.
- Pietaris, Vincas. *Algimantas*. 3rd ed. Chicago: Lithuanian Library Press, 1978.
- Poška, Dionizas. *Raštai* [Writings]. Edited by J. Kruopas et al. Vilnius: Valstybinė Grožinės Literatūros Leidykla, 1959.
- Skirmuntt, Konstancya [pseud. Futurus]. *Nosce te Ipsum*. Vilnius: Znico, 1914.
- . *Z najstarszych czasów plemienia Litewskiego* [About the Oldest Times of the Lithuanian Tribe]. Cracow: Gebethner i Spółka, 1892.
- . *Mindaugas Lietuvos Karalius* [Mindaugas Lithuania's King]. Translated from Polish by Petras Vileišis, Kaunas: Banaičio, 1907.
- . *Istorija Lietuwos: Trumpa Apysaka* [Lithuania's History: A Short Tale]. Translated from Polish by Petras Vileišis, New York: Lietuwiszkojo Balso, 1887.
- Schlözer, August. *Geschichte von Littauen, Kurland, und Liefland*. Halle: Gebauer, 1785.
- Stanevičius, Simonas. *Raštai*. [Writings]. Edited by Jurgis Lebedys. Vilnius: Vaga, 1967.
- Strykowski, Maciej. *Kronika Polska, Litewska, Żmódzka i wszystkiej Rusi*. [Chronicle of Poland, Lithuania, Samogitia and all of Rus']. 1582. Warsaw: Glucksberg, 1846.

Strykowski, Maciej. *O początkach, wywodach, dzielnościach, prawach rycerskich i domowych sławnego narodu litewskiego, żemojdzkiego i ruskiego* [About the Origins, the Derivation, the Gallantry, Knights Deeds, and the Domestic Affairs of the Great Lithuanian, Samogitian and Rusin Nations]. Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1978.

Szlupas, Jan. *Litwini i Polacy* [Lithuanians and Poles]. New York: Lietuviszkas Bašas, 1887.

Šliūpas, Jonas. *Jaunatvė — gyvenimo pavasaris* [Youth — Life's Spring]. Šiauliai: Titnagas, 1927.

_____. *Lietuvystės praeite, dabartis ir ateitis: Istoriskai sociologiskas piešinys* [Lithuanisms Past, Present and Future: A Historical Sociological Picture]. Baltimore: Kardo, 1897.

_____. *Lietuvių Pratėviai Mažajoje Azijoje: Nuo senovės iki jie pateko po valdžia Persu.* [Lithuanian Ancestry in Asia Minor: From the Earliest to the Time They Came under the Rule of the Persians]. Chicago: Lietuvos, 1899.

_____. *Lietuvių Tauta Senovėje ir Šiadien* [The Lithuanian Nation in the Past and Today]. 3 vols. Plymouth: Vienybė Lietuvninku, 1904.

_____. [pseud. Lietuvos Mylėtojas]. *Lietuviszkiejie Rasztai ir Rasztininkai* [Lithuanian Writings and Writers]. Tilsit: Baltimore M.D.L.M. Daugystės, 1890.

_____. *Mažoji arba Prusiškoji Lietuva 19-tame šimtmeityje* [Lithuania Minor or Prussian Lithuania in the 19th Century]. Chicago: Lietuvos, 1910.

_____. *Rinkiniai Raštai* [Selected Writings]. Vilnius: Vaga, 1977

Voigt, Johannes. *Geschichte Preussens von den ältesten Zeiten bis zum Untergange der Herrschaft des deutschen Orden.* 9 vols. Königsberg: Borntrager, 1827-1839.

Valančius, Motiejus. *Pastabos pačiam sau.* [Notes to Myself]. Translated and edited by Juozas Tumas, Klaipėda: Ryto, 1929.

_____. *Raštai* [Writings]. Edited by K. Korsakas et al. 2 vols. Vilnius: Vaga, 1972.

Žiugžda, Juozas, et al., eds. *Lietuvos TSR Istorijos Šaltiniai* [Lithuanian SSR History Sources]. 4 vols. Vilnius: Mintis, 1955-1965.

PERIODICALS

Ausra. Tilsit and Ragnet: 1883-1886.

Lietuwiszskasis Batsas. New York: 1885-1889.

Šviesa. Tilsit: 1887-1888, 1890.

Tevynės Sargas. Tilsit: 1895-1904.

Unija. New York: 1884-1885.

Vienybė Lietuvninkų. Plymouth Pa.: 1890-1895.

Varpas. Tilsit and Ragnet: 1889-1906.

Varpas. "Vincas Kudirkos jubilėjinis numeris" [Vincas Kudirka's Commemorative Issue]. Kaunas: Varpo, 1924.

Žemaičių ir Lietuvos Apžvalga. Tilsit: 1892.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Books

Alekna, Antanas. *Lietuvos Istorija*. Kaunas: Šviesos, 1991.

_____. *Žemaičių vyskupas Motiejus Valančius* [The Samogitian Bishop Motiejus Valančius]. Klaipėda: Lituaniijos, 1922. Reprint, Chicago: Lituaniistikos Institutas, 1975.

Aleksandravičius, Egidijus. *XIX amžiaus profiliai* [19th Century Profiles]. Vilnius: Lietuvos rašytojų sąjungos leidykla, 1993.

_____. *Kultūrinis sąjūdis Lietuvoje: 1831-1863 metais* [Cultural Movement in Lithuania: 1831-1863]. Vilnius: Mokslas, 1989.

_____. *Prieš Aušrą: Jaunieji Daukanto Bičiuliai* [Before Aušra: The Young Friends of Daukantas]. Vilnius: Žaltvykslė, 1990.

Aleksandravičius, Egidijus, and Antanas Kulakauskas. *Carų valdžioje: Lietuva XIX amžiuje* [Under the Government of the Tsars: Lithuania in the 19th Century]. Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 1996.

Aleksandravičius, Egidijus, et al., eds. *Blaivybė Lietuvoje XIX amžiuje* [Temperance in 19th Century Lithuania]. Vol. 2, *Lietuvių Atgimimo Istorijos Studijos* [Studies in the History of the Lithuanian Rebirth]. Vilnius: Sietynas, 1990.

_____. *Tautinės savimonės žadintojai: nuo asmens iki partijos* [The Awakeners of National Consciousness: From the Individual to the Party]. Vol. 1, *Lietuvių Atgimimo Istorijos Studijos*. Vilnius: Sietynas, 1990.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. 2nd ed. New York: Verso, 1993.

Aničas, Jonas. *Petras Vileišis 1851-1926*. Vilnius: Alma Littera, 1993.

Bagdanavičius, Vytautas, Petras Jonika, and Juozas Balčiūnas, eds. *Kovos Metai dėl savosios spaudos* [The Years of Struggle for Our Press]. Chicago: Lithuanian Community of Chicago Area, 1957.

Bardach, Juliusz. *O dawniej i niedawnej Litwie* [About Old and Not so Old Lithuania]. Poznań: Uniwersytet Adama Mickiewicza, 1988.

Biržiška, Mykolas. *Iš mūsų Kultūros ir Literatūros Istorijos* [From Our Cultural and Literary History]. Kaunas: Spindulio, 1931.

_____. *Lietuvių Tautos Kelias* [The Lithuanian's National Road]. 2 vols. Los Angeles: Lietuvių Dienos, 1952.

_____. *Senasis Vilniaus Universitetas* [Old Vilnius University]. London: Nidos, 1955.

Biržiška, Vaclovas. *Lietuviškieji Slapyvardžiai ir Slapyraidės* [Lithuanian Pseudonyms and Pseudo Initials]. Kaunas: Bibliografijos Žinių Priedas, 1943.

_____. *Praeities Pabiros: Rinkinys Straipsnių iš Lietuvos Praeities* [Scatterings of the Past: A Collection of Articles from Lithuania's Past]. Los Angeles: Karys, 1960.

_____. *Senujų Lietuvišku Knygų Istorija* [A History of Old Lithuanian Books]. 2 vols. Chicago: Lithuanian Literary Society of Chicago, 1953-1957.

_____. *Vyskupo Motiejaus Valančiaus Biografijos Bruožai* [A Biographical Sketch of Bishop Motiejaus Valančiaus]. Brooklyn: Aidų, 1952.

Biržiška, Vaclovas, et al., eds. *Lietuvių Enciklopedija*. 37 vols. Boston: Lietuvių Enciklopedijos Leidykla, 1953-1985.

- Brensztejn, Michał. *Dionizy Paszkiewicz: Pisarz Polsko-Litewski na Żmudzi* [Dionizias Poška: Polish-Lithuanian Writer in Samogitia]. Vilnius: Św. Wojciecha, 1934.
- Brock, Peter. *Folk Cultures and Little Peoples: Aspects of National Awakening in East Central Europe*. Boulder: East European Monographs, 1992.
- Butrimas, Adomas, et al. *Žemaitijos istorija* [Samogitia's history]. Vilnius: Regnum Fondas, 1997.
- Būtėnas, Julius. *Vinco Kudirkos Bendražygiai* [Vincas Kudirka's Compatriots]. Vilnius: Lietuvos rašytojų sąjungos leidykla, 1993.
- _____. *Vincas Kudirka*. Vilnius: Vytury, 1988.
- Chadwick, Owen. *The Secularization of the European Mind in the 19th Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Chlebowczyk, Józef. *On Small and Young Nations in Europe: Nation Forming Processes in Ethnic Borderlands in East-Central Europe*. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1980.
- Commager, Henry Steele. *The Study of History*. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1966.
- Čepėnas, Pranas, ed. *Lietuvos Universitetas 1579-1803-1922*. Chicago: Lietuvių Profesorių Draugija Amerikoje, 1972.
- _____. *Naujųjų Laikų Lietuvos Istorija*. [A History of Modern Lithuania]. 2 vols. Chicago: Griniaus Fondas, 1977.
- Davies, Norman. *God's Playground: A History of Poland*. 2 vols. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.
- Eidintas, Alfonsas. *Jonas Šliūpas*. Kaunas: Šviesa, 1989.
- Eidintas, Alfonsas, and Gediminas Rudis, eds. *Naujas Požiūris į Lietuvos Istoriją* [A New Look at Lithuanian History]. Kaunas: Šviesa, 1989.
- Eidintas, Alfonsas, Algirdas Gaižutis, and Vytautas Merkys. *Lietuvių Nacionalinio Išsivadavimo Judėjimas ligi 1904 metų* [The Lithuanian National Liberation Movement to 1904]. Vilnius: Mokslas, 1987.
- Fainhauz, David. *Lithuanians in the USA: Aspects of Ethnic Identity*. Chicago: Lithuanian Library Press, 1991.

- Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1992.
- _____. *Thought and Change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Genzelis, Bronius. *Pasakojimai apie Lietuvos Mąstytojus* [Stories about Lithuania's Thinkers]. Kaunas: Šviesa, 1994.
- _____. *Švietėjai ir Jų Idėjos Lietuvoje (XIX a.)* [Enlighteners and Their Ideas (19th Century)]. Vilnius: Mintis, 1972.
- Gineitis, Leonas. *Lietuvių Literatūros Istorigrafia* [The Historiography of Lithuanian Literature]. Vilnius: Vaga, 1982.
- Gineitis, Leonas, ed. *Lietuvių Literatūros Istorigrafos Chrestomatija* [An Anthology of the Historiography of Lithuanian Literature]. Vilnius: Vaga, 1988.
- Godlewski, Józef, et al., eds. *Pamiętnik Wileński* [Wilno Diary]. London: Polska Fundacja Kulturalna, 1972.
- Gossman, Lionel. *Between History and Literature*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Górski, Konrad. *Divide et Impera*. Białystok: Towarzystwo Literackie im. Adama Mickiewicza Oddział Białystocki, 1995.
- Grinius, Kazys. *Atsiminimai ir Mintys* [Memoirs and Thoughts]. 2 vols. Tübingen and Chicago: Dr. Kazys Grinius Committee, 1947, 1962.
- Hegel, Georg. W. F. *Reason in History: A General Introduction to the Philosophy of History*. Translated by Robert S. Hartman. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1953.
- Herbaczewski, Józef A. *Głos bólu (Sprawa odrodzenia narodowego Litwy w związku ze sprawą wyzwolenia narodowego polski)* [The Voice of Pain: The Question of the Lithuanian National Rebirth in Conjunction with the Question of Polish National Liberation]. Cracow: Krzyżanowski, 1912.
- _____. *Odrodzenie Litwy wobec idei polskiej* [The Lithuanian Rebirth in Relation to the Polish Idea]. Cracow: n.p., 1905.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

- Hobsbawm, Eric J., and Terrance Ranger, eds. *The Invention of Tradition*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Hroch, Miroslav. *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe: A Comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of Patriotic Groups among the Smaller European Nations*. Translated by Ben Fawkes. Cambridge: University Press, 1985.
- Hutchinson, John, and Anthony D. Smith, eds. *Nationalism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Iggers, Georg G., and Jame M. Powell, eds. *Leopold von Ranke and the Shaping of the Historical Discipline*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1990.
- Ivinskis, Zenonas. *Lietuvos Istorija: iki Vytauto Didžiojo Mirties* [Lithuania's History to Vytautas the Great's Death]. Rome: Lietuvių Katalikų Mokslo Akademija, 1978.
- Jablonskis, Konstantinas. *Istorija ir jos šaltiniai* [History and Its Sources]. Edited by Vytautas Merkys. Vilnius: Mokslas, 1979.
- _____. *Lietuvių Kultūra ir Jos Veikejai* [Lithuanian Culture and Its Activists]. Edited by Vytautas Merkys. Vilnius: Mintis, 1973.
- Jakštas, Juozas. *Dr. Jonas Šliūpas*. Chicago: Akademinės Skautijos Leidykla, 1979.
- Jancevičius, A. *Vilniaus Universitetui-400*. Vilnius: Mokslas, 1979.
- Janulaitis, Augustinas. *Mikalojus Akelaitis*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1969.
- _____. *Praeitis ir Jos Tyrimo Rūpesčiai* [The Past and its Research Concerns]. Edited by Jonas Kubilius et al. Vilnius: Mokslas, 1989.
- Jasaitis, Juozas. *Motiejus Valančius*. Kaunas: Šviesa, 1994.
- Jasaitis, Juozas, ed. *Žalia Bruknelė Daukantui* [A Green Bilberry for Daukantas]. Vilnius: Lietuvos Rašytojų Sąjunga, 1993.
- Jučas, Mečislovas. *Lietuvos Metraščiai* [Lithuania's Chronicles]. Vilnius: Vaga, 1968.
- Jurginis, Juozas. *Istorija ir Kultūra* [History and Culture]. Vilnius: Mintis, 1984.
- _____. *Legendos apie Lietuvių Kilmę* [Legends about the Origins of the Lithuanians]. Vilnius: Vaga, 1971.

- Jurginis, Juozas, and I. Lukšaitė. *Lietuvos Kultūros Istorijos Bruožai* [An Outline of Lithuanian Cultural History]. Vilnius: Mokslas, 1981.
- Kavolis, Vytautas. *Žmogus Istorijoje* [Man in History]. Vilnius: Vaga, 1994.
- Kaunas, Doimas. *Aušrininkas: Tautinio atgimimo spaudos kūrėjas Jurgis Mikšas* [Aušrininkas: Jurgis Mikšas the Creator of the Lithuanian Rebirth's Press]. Vilnius: Kultūra, 1996.
- Kirbry, David. *The Baltic World 1772-1993: Europe's Northern Periphery in and Age of Change*. New York: Longman, 1995.
- Kohn, Hans. *Nationalism: Its Meaning and History*. Malabar: Krieger, 1965; Reprint, 1982.
- Korsakas, Kostas, ed. *Lietuvių Literatūros Istorija* [A History of Lithuanian Literature]. 4 vols. Vilnius: Valstybinė Politinės ir Mosklinė Literatūros Leidykla, 1957-1968.
- Kryżanowski, Julian. *A History of Polish Literature*. Warsaw: Polish Scientific Publishers, 1978.
- Kridl, Manfred, ed. *A Survey of Polish Literature and Culture*. Translated by Olga Scherer-Vorski, Hague: Mouton, 1967.
- Kubilius, Vytautas. *Lietuvių Literatūra ir Pasaulinės Literatūros Procesas* [Lithuanian Literature and the Process of World Literature]. Vilnius: Vaga, 1983.
- Kuolys, Darius. *Asmuo, Tauta, Valstybė Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės istorinėje literatūroje: Renesansas Barokas* [The Individual, Nation, and State in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania's Historical Literature: Renaissance Baroque]. Vilnius: Mokslo ir Encyklo-pedijų Leidykla, 1992.
- Lebedys, Jurgis. *Simonas Stanevičius*. Vilnius: Valstybinė Grožinės Literatūros Leidykla, 1955.
- Lewandowski, Józef. *Federalizm, Litwa i Białoruś w polityce obozu belwederskiego* [Federalism, Lithuania and Belarus in the Politics of the Camp of the Belvedere]. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawn. Naukowe, 1962.
- Le Goff, Jacques. *History and Memory*. Translated by Steven Rendall and Elizabeth Claman. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.
- Lietuviškoji Tarybinė Enciklopedija* [Lithuanian Soviet Encyclopedia]. 14 vols. Vilnius: Mokslas, 1976-1985.

- Limanowski, Bolesław. *Pamiętniki, 1835-1870* [Memoirs 1835-1870]. Warsaw: Rój, 1937.
- Lieven, Anatol. *The Baltic Revolution: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and the Path to Independence*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Loit, A., ed. *National Movements in the Baltic Countries during the Nineteenth Century*. Stockholm: Studia Baltica Stockholmiensa, 1985.
- Lukoševičius, Vincentas. *Liberalizmo Raida Lietuvoje XIX a. pab.- 1940* [The Course of Liberalism in Lithuania from the Late 19th Century to 1940]. Vilnius: Valstybinis Leidybos Centras, 1995.
- Lukšienė, Meilė. *Demokratinė ugdymo mintis Lietuvoje* [The Idea of a Democratic Education in Lithuania]. Vilnius: Mokslas, 1985.
- Łossowski, Piotr. *Po tej i tamtej stronie Niemna: Stosunki polsko-litewskie 1883-1939* [On This and That Side of the Nieman: Polish-Lithuanian Relations 1883-1939]. Warsaw: Czytelnik, 1985.
- Maciūnas, Vincas. *Lituanistinis Sąjūdis XIX Amžiaus Pradžioje* [The Lithuanianist Movement in the Early 19th Century]. Kaunas: Varpas, 1939.
- Matulaitis, Stasys. *Lietuvių Tautos Istorija* [The History of the Lithuanian Nation]. Kaunas: Švyturio, 1923.
- Merkys, Vytautas. *Simonas Daukantas*. Vilnius: Švyturys, 1991.
- _____. *Lietuvos Valstiečiai ir Spauda XIXa. pabaigoje - XXa. Pradžioje* [Lithuania's Peasants and the Press at the End of the 19th Century and the Beginning of the 20th Century]. Vilnius: Mokslas, 1982.
- _____. *Nelegalioji Lietuvių Spauda Kapitalizmo Laikotarpiu (ligi 1904)* [The Illegal Lithuanian Press in the Period of Capitalism to 1904]. Vilnius: Mokslas, 1978.
- Merkys, Vytautas, ed. *Lietuvių nacionalinio išsivadavimo judėjimas (ligi 1904 metų)* [The Lithuanian National Liberation Movement to 1904]. Vilnius: Mokslas, 1987.
- Milius, Vacys. *Mokslo Draugijos ir Lietuvių Etnografija* [Learned Societies and Lithuanian Ethnography]. Vilnius: Mokslo ir Enciklopedijų Leidykla, 1993.
- Miłosz, Czesław. *The Captive Mind*. Translated by Jane Zielonko. New York: Vintage Books, 1990.

Miłosz, Czesław. *Tevynės Ieškojimas* [Searching for the Fatherland]. Szukanie Ojczyzny, 1992. Translated from Polish into Lithuanian by Baltos Lankos. Vilnius: Baltos Lankos, 1995.

Miškinis, Motiejus. *Lietuvių Literatūra* [Lithuanian Literature]. Kaunas: Spaudos Fondas, 1939.

Motieka, Egidijus, et al., eds. *Asmuo: tarp tautos ir valstybės* [The Individual: Between the Nation and the State]. Vol. 8, *Lietuvių Atgimimo Istorijos Studijos*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir Enciklopedijų leidykla, 1996.

_____. *Atgimimas ir Katalikų Bažnyčia* [Rebirth and the Catholic Church]. Vol. 7, *Lietuvių Atgimimo Istorijos Studijos*. Vilnius: Katalikų pasaulio, 1994.

Motieka, Egidijus, et al., eds.. *Simonas Daukantas*. Vol. 5, *Lietuvių Atgimimo Istorijos Studijos*. Vilnius: Viltis, 1993.

Ochmański, Jerzy. *Historia Litwy*. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1990.

_____. *Litewski ruch narodowo-kulturalny w XIX wieku (do 1890 r.)* [The Lithuanian Cultural-National Movement in the 19th Century (to 1890)]. Białystok: Białostockie Towarzystwo Naukowe, 1965.

Petronis, Jonas. *Petras Vileišis*. Vilnius: Vaga, 1992.

Pranckietytė, Gražina. *Jono Šliūpo Filosofinė Kūryba* [Jonas Šliūpa's Philosophical Creation]. Vilnius: Filosofijos, Sociologijos ir Teisės Institutas, 1993.

Propolanis, Kazimeras. *Polskie apostołstwo w Litwie: Szkic historyczny* [Polish Apostleship in Lithuania: A Historical Sketch]. Vilnius: Kuchty, 1913.

Rakauskas, Vytautas, ed. *Devynioliktan amžium įžengus* [Upon Entering the Nineteenth Century]. Vol. 3, *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra* [Old Lithuanian Literature]. Vilnius: Pradai, 1994.

Rimka, Albinas. *Lietuvių Tautos Atgimimo Socialiniai Pagrindai "Auszros" – "Varpo" Gadynės (1883-93) Socioekonominiai Raštai* [The Lithuanian National Rebirth's Social Foundations "Auszra" – "Varpas" Era (1883-93) Socioeconomic Writings]. Kaunas: Vytauto Didžiojo Universiteto Teisių Fakulteto, 1932.

Riškus, Jonas. *Lietuvių Literatura XIX a. Pirmoji puse* [Lithuanian Literature in the First Half of the 19th Century]. Vilnius: Mokslas, 1982.

- Roberts, Henry L. *Eastern Europe: Politics, Revolution, and Diplomacy*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970.
- Römer, Michał. *Litwa. Studium o odrodzeniu narodu Litewskiego* [Lithuania: A Study about the Lithuanian National Rebirth]. Lwów: Polskie Tow. Nakładowe, 1908.
- . *Stosunki etnograficzne-kulturalne na Litwie* [Ethnographic-Cultural Relations in Lithuania]. Cracow: Krytyka, 1906.
- Senn, Alfred Erich. *Jonas Basanavičius: The Patriarch of the Lithuanian National Renaissance*. Newtonville, Mass.: Oriental Research Partners, 1980.
- Serejski, Marian Henryk. *Joachim Lelewel: Z dziejów postępowej myśli historycznej w Polsce* [Joachim Lelewel: From the History of Progressive Historical Thought in Poland]. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1953.
- Smith, Anthony. *National Identity*. Reno: University of Nevada Press, 1991.
- Smith, Anthony, ed. *Ethnicity and Nationalism*. New York: E. J. Brill, 1992.
- Stoberski, Zygmunt. *Historia literatury litewskiej* [The History of Lithuanian Literature]. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1986.
- Stukas, Jack J. *Awakening Lithuania: A Study on the Rise of Modern Lithuanian Nationalism*. Madison, NJ: Florham Park Press, 1966.
- Sužiedėlis, Simas, et al., eds. *Encyclopedia Lituanica*. 6 vols. Boston: Kapočius, 1970-1978.
- Szlupas, John. *Essay on the Past, Present and Future of Lithuania*. Stockholm: Svenska Andelsförlaget, 1918.
- Szporluk, Roman. *Communism and Nationalism: Karl Marx versus Friedrich List*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Šalkauskis, Stasys. *Pedagoginiai Raštai* [Pedagogic Writings]. Kaunas: Romuvoje, 1921. Translated as "Sur les Confins de deux Mondes," in *Essai synthétique sur le problème de la Civilisation Nationale en Lituanie*. Geneva: 1919.
- Šapoka, Adolfas. *Senasis Vilnius* [Old Vilnius]. New York: Pranciškonų Spaustuvė, 1963.

- Šešplaukis, Alfonsas. *J.G. Herderis ir baltų tautos* [J.G. Herder and the Baltic Nations]. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1995.
- Šidlauskas, Algirdas. *Istorija Vilniaus Universitete XIXa. pirmojoje puseje* [History at Vilnius University in the First Half of the 19th Century]. Vilnius: Mokslas, 1986.
- _____. *Istorija Vilniaus Universitete XVIa. pabaigoje - XIXa. pradžioje* [History at Vilnius University from the End of the 16th Century to the Beginning of the 19th Century]. Vilnius: Mokslas, 1989.
- Šidlauskas, Algirdas, and Arnoldas Piročkinas. *Mokslas Senajame Vilniaus Universitete* [Education at Old Vilnius University]. Vilnius: Mokslas, 1984.
- Thaden, Edward C. *Russia's Western Borderlands, 1710-1870*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Totoraitis, Jonas. *Lietuvos atgijimas* [Lithuania's Recovery]. Chicago: Draugas, 1921.
- Trumpa, Vincas. *Lietuva XIX-Tame Amžiuje* [Lithuania in the 19th Century]. Chicago: Morkūno, 1989.
- Tumas-Vaižgantas, Juozas. *Lietuvių Literatūros Paskaitos. Draudžiamasis laikas. "Aušrininkų" grupė*: J.A. Vištelis, M.D. Silvestravičius, T. Zičkis, J. Myliauskia [Lectures on Lithuanian Literature. The Prohibition Era. The "Auszra" Group: J.A. Vištelis, M.D. Silvestravičius, T. Zičkis, J. Myliauskia]. Kaunas: Mintis, 1924.
- _____. *Lietuvių Literatūros Paskaitos. Draudžiamasis laikas "Šviesos" grupė* [Lectures on Lithuanian Literature. The Prohibition Era. The "Šviesos" Group]. Kaunas: Mintis, 1924.
- _____. *Motiejus Valančius, Žemaičių vyskupas: Maskoliams katalikus persekiojant* [Motiejus Valančius, the Samogitian Bishop: The Persecution of the Catholics by the Moscovites]. Kaunas: Žinijos, 1929; Reprinted in *Tautos Praeitis*, 3, no. 4 (1976), Chicago Ill.: 57-181.
- _____. *Vaižganto Raštai* [Vaižgantas's Writings]. Vol. 12, *Mūsų Literatūros Istorijai* [Our Literature's History]. Vaižgantas, Aušrininkai, Šviesininkai. Kaunas: Hum Mokslų Fakulteto Leidiny, 1929.
- Turska, Halina. *O powstaniu polskich obszarów językowych na Wileńszczyźnie* [Concerning the Start of the Spread of the Polish language in the Vilnius Region]. 1939. Reprint, Vilnius: Mintis, 1995.

- Vaičiulaitis, Antanas, et al. *Maironis: Jo Gimimo Šimtmečiui Paminėti* [Maironis: Celebrating His Hundredth Birthday]. Brooklyn: Aidų, 1963.
- Valančius, Grigas. *Žemaičių Didysis* [The Great Samogitian]. 2 vols. Los Angeles: author, 1978.
- Van Reenan, Antanas. *Lithuanian Diaspora: Königsberg to Chicago*. New York: University Press of America, 1990.
- Vanagas, Vytautas. *Dionizas Poška*. Vilnius: Pradai, 1994.
- Varnienė, Regina, et al., eds. *Lietuviškieji Slapyvardžiai: Medžiaga Lietuviškųjų Slapyvardžių Sąvadas* [Lithuanian Pseudonyms: Material about the Collection of Lithuanian Pseudonyms]. Vilnius: Lietuvos nacionalinė Martyno Mažvydo biblioteka Bibliografijos ir knygotyros centras, 1995.
- Vėbra, Rimantas. *Lietuvos katalikų dvasininkija ir visuomeninis judėjimas* [The Lithuanian Catholic Clergy and Social Activism]. Vilnius: Mintis, 1968.
- _____. *Lietuvių Tautos Atgimimas (XIX a. Antroji Pusė)* [The Lithuanian Nation's Rebirth (the Second Half of the 19th Century)]. Vilnius: Vilnius University, 1995.
- _____. *Lietuviškos Spaudos Draudimas: 1864-1904* [The Lithuanian Press Ban 1864-1904]. Vilnius: Pradai, 1996.
- _____. *Lietuvių visuomenė XIX a. antrojoje pusėje* [Lithuanian Society in the Second Half of the 19th Century]. Vilnius: Mokslas, 1990.
- _____. *Lietuvių Tautinis Atgimimas XIX Amžiuje* [The Lithuanian National Rebirth in the 19th Century]. Kaunas: Šviesa, 1992.
- Venclova, Tomas. *Tomas Venclova: vilties formos* [Tomas Venclova: The Shapes of Hope]. Vilnius: Spindulio, 1991.
- Vidmantas, Edvardas. *Katalikų Bažnyčia ir Nacionalinis Klausimas Lietuvoje XIX a. Antrojoje Pusėje - XX a. Pradžioje* [The Catholic Church and the National Question in Lithuania in the Second Half of 19th Century and the Start of the 20th Century]. Vilnius: Mokslas, 1987.
- _____. *Religinis Tautinis Sąjūdis Lietuvoje: XIX a. Antrojoje Pusėje - XX a. Pradžioje* [The Religious National Movement in Lithuania in the Second Half of the 19th and the Beginning of the 20th Century]. Vilnius: Katalikų Adademija, 1995.

- Vyšniauskaitė, Angelė. *Lietuviai IXa.–XIXa. vidurio istoriniuose šaltiniuose* [The Lithuanians in Historical Sources from the 9th Century to the 19th Century]. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų Leidykla, 1994.
- Walicki, Andrzej. *Poland Between East and West: The Controversies over Self Definition and Modernization in Partitioned Poland*. Cambridge: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1994.
- Wandycz, Piotr S. *The Lands of Partitioned Poland 1795-1918*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1974.
- Waswo, Richard. *The Founding Legend of Western Civilization: From Virgil to Vietnam*. Hanover: Wesleyan University Press, 1997.
- White, Hayden. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1973.
- Wielhorski, Władysław. *Polska a Litwa: Stosunki wzajemne w biegu Dziejów* [Poland and Lithuania: Mutual relations in the course of History]. London: Polish Research Center, 1947.
- Weeks, Theodore. *Nation and State in Late Imperial Russia: Nationalism and Russification on the Western Frontier, 1863-1914*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1996.
- Zaborskaitė, Vanda. *Maironis*. Vilnius: Vaga, 1987.
- Zinkevičius, Zigmas. *The History of the Lithuanian Language*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1996.
- Žukas, Saulius. *Simonas Daukantas: Gyvenimas ir Kuryba* [Simonas Daukantas: His Life and Works]. Kaunas: Šviesa, 1988.
- Žukas, Vladas. *Lietuvių knygotyros bruožai* [The Character of Lithuanian Book Research]. Vilnius: Mokslas, 1989.
- Articles**
- Aleksandravičius, Egidijus. "Jonas Šliūpas–Istorikas" [Jonas Šliūpas–Historian]. *Lietuvos Istorijos Metraštis* (Vilnius: Alma Littera, 1995): 217-277
- . "Juzefo Ignaco Kraševskio Fenomenas" [The Phenomena of Józef Ignacy Kraszewski]. In Kraševskis, Juzefas Ignacas. *Kunigas*. Translated by Jonas Kličius (Vilnius: Sata, 1994): 201-206.

- Aleksandravičius, Egidijus. "Political Goals of Lithuanians, 1863-1918." *Journal of Baltic Studies*, 23, no. 3 (1992): 227-238.
- . "Socialinės ir Psichologinės Lietuvos Romantines Istoriografijos Prielaidos" [Social and Psychological Assumptions in Lithuania's Romantic Historiography]. *Sietynas*, 9 (Vilnius: 1990): 140-154.
- Aleksandravičius, Egidijus, and Antanas Kulakauskas. "Istorijos istorija arba XIXa. tyrinėjimu apžvalga" [The History of History or a Survey of 19th-Century Research]. *Akademikas*, 1 (Kaunas: January-February, 1993): 25.
- Backus, Oswald P. "The Problem of Unity in the Polish-Lithuanian State." *Slavic Review*, 22 (1963): 411-431.
- Balčiūnas, J.M. "Liudviko Adomo Jucevičiaus asmuo ir reikšmė" [Ludwik Jucewicz's Person and Meaning]. *Tauta ir Žodis*, 6 (Kaunas: Humanitarinių Mokslų Fakulteto leidinys, 1930): 315-349.
- Basanavičius, Jonas. "Levas lietuvių pasakosė bei dainosė ir prygiškai-trakiškoje dailoje" [The Lion in Lithuanian Stories and Song and Phrygian-Thracian Art]. *Lietuvių Tauta*, 2 (Vilnius: 1909): 161-308.
- Bumblauskas, Alfredas. "Renesanso Lietuvoje ir Nacionalinės Lietuvių Kultūros Formavimosi Pradžios Klausimu" [The Renaissance in Lithuania and the Question of the Beginning of a Lithuanian National Culture]. *Istorija*, 22 (Vilnius: Mokslas, 1982): 47-65.
- Cynarski, Stanisław. "The Shape of Sarmatian Ideology in Poland." *Acta Poloniae Historica*, 12 (1968): 6-17.
- Fainhauz, David. "Lietuviai Išeiviai Paryžiuje: Želmens Draugija 1886-1914" [Lithuanian Immigrants in Paris: The Želmens Society 1886-1914]. *Aidai*, 1 (Brooklyn, NY: January, 1988): 21-29.
- Gaigalaitė, A. "Istoriografinės Koncepcijos Lietuvoje" [Historiographical Concepts in Lithuania]. *Problemos*, 1, no. 1 (Vilnius: Mintis, 1970): 48-55.
- Genzelis, Bronius. "Pozityvistinės Idėjos Lietuvoje (XIX a.)" [Positivist Ideas in 19th-Century Lithuania]. *Problemos*, 1, no. 11 (Vilnius: Mintis, 1973): 64.
- Girnius, Saulius. "Bishop Motiejus Valančius: A Man for All Seasons." *Lituanus*, 22, no. 2 (1976): 5-28.

- Ivinskis, Zenonas. "Lietuvos Istorija Romantizmo metu ir Dabar" [Lithuanian History during the Period of Romanticism and Now]. *L.K.M.A. Suvažiavimo Darbai*. Vol. 3 (Kaunas: Šviesos, 1940): 320-341.
- _____. "Simonas Daukantas ir jo palikimas Lietuvos Istorijos srityje" [Simonas Daukantas and His Legacy in the Area of Lithuanian History]. *Aidai*, 9 (Brooklyn: November, 1964): 385-395.
- Jakštas, Juozas. "Lietuvos Aušrinė istoriografija" [Lithuania's Auszra Historiography]. *L.K.M.A. Suvažiavimo Darbai*, 8 (Rome: 1974): 235-238.
- _____. "Lietuvos Aušrinė istoriografija Pagal Maironi ir Pietari" [Lithuania's Auszra Historiography according to Maironis and Pietaris]. *Aidai*, 7 (Brooklyn: September, 1971): 305-307.
- _____. "How Firm was the Polish-Lithuanian Federation?" *Slavic Review*, 22 (1963): 442-449.
- _____. "Istorijos Skyrius" [The History Department]. In *Lietuvos Universitetas*. Edited by Pranas Čepėnas. (Chicago: Lietuvių Profesorių Draugiją Amerikoje, 1972): 405-415.
- _____. "Simonas Daukantas—Pirmas Tautinės Lietuvos Istorikas" [Simonas Daukantas—National Lithuania's First Historian]. *Tautos Praeitis*, 2, no. 2 (Chicago: 1965): 3-18.
- _____. "Vyskupas Motiejus Valančius savo laikuose ir dabar" [Bishop Motiejus Valančius in His Time and Today]. *Tautos Praeitis*, 3, no. 4 (Chicago: 1976): 9-26.
- Jatulis, Paulius. "Vyskupas Motiejus Valančius: Nauja Medžiaga iš Vatikano Archyvo—Laiškai (1850-1868)" [New Materials from the Vatican Archives—Letters Written between 1850 and 1868 Dealing with Bishop Valančius]. *Tautos Praeitis*, 3, no. 4 (Chicago: 1976): 33-55.
- Jonynas, Ignas. "Lietuvos Istorografija" [Lithuania's Historiography]. Translated from Russian by Rita Strazdūnaitė in *Istorijos Baruose* [In the Field of History]. Edited by Vytautas Merkys. (Vilnius: Mokslas, 1984): 99-189.
- Jučas, Mečislovas. "Vilniaus Universiteto Istorijos Katedra" [The History Department at the University of Vilnius]. *Istorija*, 27 (Vilnius: Mokslas, 1987): 22-34.

- Kulakauskas, Antanas. "M. Valančius ir XIX a septintojo dešimtmečio švietimo reforma" [M. Valančius and the Education Reform of the Seventh Decade of the 19th Century]. *Istorija*, 27 (Vilnius: Mokslas, 1987): 36-54.
- Lebionka, J. "V. Kudirkos Idėjiniu Pažiūrų Formavimasis" [The Formation of V. Kudirka's Views]. *Lietuvos TSR Mokslų Akademijos Darbai*, 1, no. 4 (Vilnius: 1958): 245-254.
- Lopata, Raimundas. "The Second Spring of Nations and the Theory of Reconstruction of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania." *Lituanus*, 39, no. 4 (1993): 68-78.
- Łossowski, Piotr. "Gazeta 'Auszra' i początek narodowego ruchu litewskiego (1883-1886)" [The Newspaper 'Auszra' and the Beginning of the Lithuanian National Movement (1883-1886)]. In *Studia z dziejów ZSRR i Europy Środkowej*, Vol. 1, edited by Rafał Gerber, (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1965): 81-129.
- Matusas, Jonas. "Motiejus Valančius Kaip Istorikas" [Motiejus Valančius as a Historian]. *Senovė*, 4. Edited by L. Karsavin, (Kaunas: Humanitarinių Mokslų Fakulteto Leidiny, 1938): 5-24.
- Maciūnas, Vincas. "Tautos Gyvatos Giesmė" [A Nation's Life Song]. *Aidai*, 8 (Brooklyn: 1950): 353-368.
- Merkys, Vytautas. "The Lithuanian National Movement: The Problems of Polonization and Russification." In *Finland and Poland in the Russian Empire*. Edited by Michael Branch, Janet Hartley and Antoni Mączak, (London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London, 1995): 271-282.
- Miłosz, Czesław. "Vilnius, Lithuania: An Ethnic Agglomerate." In *Ethnic Identity: Cultural Continuities and Change*. Edited by George De Vos and Lola Romanucci-Ross, Palo Alto: Mayfield, 1975.
- Ochmański, Jerzy. "The National Idea in Lithuania from the Sixteenth to the First Half of the Nineteenth Century: The Problem of Cultural-Linguistic Differentiation." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 10 (1986): 300-315.
- O'Connor, Mark. "Divided Loyalties: Adam Czartoryski, Faculty Recruitment, and the Fate of Vilna University 1803-34" *East/West Education*, 13, no. 1 (1992): 29-57.
- Petrauskienė, Irena. "Lietuvos Istorijos Tyrinėtojas" [A Researcher of Lithuania's History]. *Mokslas ir Gyvenimas*, 125, no. 2 (1968): 34-36.

- Pilkauskas, Zenonas. "XIX a. Pabaigos - XX a. Pradžios istorijos vadovėliai" [Late 19th Century and Early 20th Century History Textbooks]. *Istorija*, 14, no. 2 (Vilnius: 1974): 80-101.
- Pusta, Kaarel R. "The National Revival of the Baltic Peoples in the XIX and XX Centuries." *Bulletin of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America*, 2, no.2 (1944): 371-388.
- Puzinas, Jonas. "Dr. Jonas Basanavičius—Founder of *Aušra*" *Lituanus*, 23, no. 3 (1977): 5-13.
- . "T. Narbutas mūsų prosenovės tyrinėtojas," [T. Narbut Our Prehistory's Researcher]. *Naujoji Romuva*, 7 (Kaunas: 1936): 149-152.
- Rabikauskas, Paulius. "The Academy of Vilnius as a Lithuanian Institution." *Lituanus*, 27, no. 2 (1981): 51-74.
- Ramanauskas, R. "I. Onacevičius apie T. Narbuto 'Lietuvių tautos istorija'" [I. Onacewicz about T. Narbut's "The History of the Lithuanian Nation"]. *Istorija*, 29 (Vilnius: Mokslas, 1988): 35-43.
- Senn, Alfred Erich. "The Lithuanian Intelligentsia of the Nineteenth Century." *National Movements in the Baltic Countries during the 19th Century*. Edited by Aleksander Loit. (Stockholm: Studia Baltica Stockholmiensa, 1985): 311-315.
- Schmalstieg, William R. "The Founder of Baltic Philology: Adalbert Bezzenberger." *Lituanus*, 20 no. 2 (1974): 35-43.
- Szlupas, John. "Lithuania and its Ancient Calvinistic Churches," *Princeton Theological Review*, 5, no. 4 (April, 1907): 242-280.
- Šapoka, Adolfas. "Lithuania and Poland through the Ages." *Lituanus*, 11, no. 5 (1955): 3-6.
- Šidlauskas, Algirdas. "Joachimas Lelevelis apie Istorijos Objektą savo Paskaitose" [Joachim Lelewel about the Object of History in His Lectures]. *Istorija*, 13 (Vilnius: Mintis, 1972): 41-52.
- Šenavičienė, Ieva. "Simono Daukanto Bičiuliai Peterburge" [Simonas Daukantas's friends in St. Petersburg]. *Kultūros Barai*, 11 (Vilnius: 1995): 65-70.
- Šliogeris, Arvydas. "Mažvydas ir Lietuva" [Mažvydas and Lithuania]. *Literatūra ir Menas*, (Vilnius: February 15, 1997): 3-13.

- Thaden, Edward. "Traditional Elites, Religion and Nation-Building in Finland, the Baltic Provinces and Lithuania, 1700-1914." In *Finland and Poland in the Russian Empire*. Edited by Michael Branch, Janet Hartley and Antoni Mączak, (London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London, 1995): 1-15.
- Trumpa, Vincent. "Simonas Daukantas, Historian and Pioneer of the Lithuanian National Rebirth." *Lituanus*, 1,1 no. 1 (1965): 5-17.
- _____. "The Disintegration of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth: A Commentary." *Lituanus*, 10, no. 2 (1964): 24-45.
- _____. "Lietuviai ir Lenkai" [Lithuanians and Poles]. *Metmenys*, 19 (1970): 137-149.
- _____. "Svarstymai apie XIX amžių Lietuvą" [Thoughts about 19th-Century Lithuania]. *Metmenys*, 8 (1964): 118-133.
- Venclova, Tomas. "Aušros perspektyvoje" [Aušra in Perspective]. *Draugas* (Chicago), no. 195. (October, 1983).
- _____. "Four Centuries of Enlightenment: A Historic View of the University of Vilnius 1579-1979." *Lituanus*, 27, no. 2 (1981): 5-43.
- Vidmantas, Edvardas. "Aušros įkurimas Jos Programa ir Reikšmė" [The Establishment of Aušra: Its Program and Importance]. *Lietuvos Istorijos Metraštis*, 33, no. 48. (Vilnius: Mokslas 1983).
- _____. "Varpo politinė programa" [Varpas's Political Program]. *Lituanistica*, 1, no. 5 (Vilnius: Lietuvos Mokslų Akademija, 1991): 24-33.
- Wielhorski, Władysław. "Warunki rozwoju świadomości narodowej Litwinów i powstania współczesnego państwa litewskiego (1861-1920)" [The Conditions for the Development of a Lithuanian National Consciousness and the Birth of the Modern Lithuanian State]. In *Pamiętnik VI Powszechnego Zjazdu Historyków Polskich w Wilnie*. (Lwów: Nakładem Polskiego Towarzystwa Historycznego, 1935): 126-143.
- Weeks, Theodore R. "Lithuanians, Poles, and the Russian Imperial Government at the Turn of the Century." *Journal of Baltic Studies*, 25, no. 4 (1994): 289-304.
- Yla, Stasys. "The Clash of Nationalities at the University of Vilnius." *Lituanus*, 27, no. 2 (1981): 75-96.

Zaborskaitė, Vanda. "Kijevo Istorikų Poveikis Maironio 'Apsakymams Apie Lietuvos Praeigą'" [The Influence of the Kievan Historians on Maironis's 'Tales of Lithuania's Past']. *Lietuvos TSR Mokslų Akademijos Darbai*, 2, no. 15 (Vilnius: 1963): 201-211.

Zinkevičius, Zigmas. "Lenkų Kalbos Atsiradimas Vilniuje" [The Appearance of the Polish Language in Vilnius]. *Mokslas ir Gyvenimas*, 77, no. 6 (Vilnius: 1977): 30-31.

Žukas, Vladas. "A. Vištelis—Lenku Literatūros Vertejas" [A. Vištelis—A Translator of Polish Literature]. *Pergalė*, 11 (Vilnius: 1987): 179-180.

Unpublished Materials

Šliupovič, Ivan. "A Petition to the Minister of the Interior of Kaunas, Šiauliai," USSR Central State History Archive 775 F. 20 ap., 1882., 522 b., 21 l. [Photocopy].

Totoraitis, Jonas. *Die Litauer unter dem König Mindowe bis zum Jahre 1263*. University of Fribourg, dissertation, 1905.

NAMES INDEX

- Achilles: 73
 Aesop: 120
 Akelaitis, Mikolas (Akielewicz, Mikołaj): 59, 118
 Alekna, Antanas: 163
 Aleksandravičius, Egidijus: 202
 Aleksandrowicz: 113
 Alexander II: 92, 179
 Alexander III: 129, 178
 Algirdas: 4, 5, 33
 Anderson, Benedict: 196
 Antonovych, Volodymyr: 136, 160
 Aquinas, Thomas: 94
 Arndt, Ernest M.: 143
 Asnyk, Adam: 113
 Attila: 28, 74
 Ažūlaitis, Jurgis: 15

 Baliński, Michał: 55, 58, 88
 Baranuskas, Antanas: 95, 101, 123, 159
 Bartoszewicz, Julian: 96
 Basanavičius, Jonas: 20, 38, 107, 108, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 118-129, 131, 133, 135, 143, 152, 154, 158, 161, 162, 168, 169, 171, 172, 177, 178, 180, 189
 Bezzenberger, Adalbert: 37
 Biliūnas, Jonas: 179, 180
 Biržiška, Mykolas: 114
 Blumbenbach, Johann: 131
 Bobrzyński, Michał: 172, 176
 Bohlen, Peter von: 74
 Bohusz, Ksawier: 47, 51, 54, 167
 Bopp, Franz: 120
 Borshevsky, Ivan: 56
 Brensztejn, Michał: 52
 Brückner, Aleksander: 55, 177
 Buckle, Henry Thomas: 137
 Būga, Kazimeras: 128, 177
 Burba, Aleksandras: 137

 Chlebowczyk, Józef: 19, 83, 110
 Chodźko, Ignacy: 113
 Collingwood, R.G.: 3
 Comte, August: 137
 Copernicus, Nicolaus: 113
 Courtenay, Baudouin de: 37
 Croce, Benedetto: 1
 Czacki, Tadeusz: 31
 Czartoryski, Adam: 13, 66
 Czeczot, Jan: 56

 Dambrauskas-Jakštas, Aleksandras: 140
 Daniłowicz, Ignacy: 12, 31, 32, 33, 67, 70, 73, 87, 190
 Darwin, Charles: 137
 Dashkevych, Nikolai: 160
 Daukantas, Simonas: 12, 14-20, 25, 26, 30, 31, 34, 35, 46, 49, 50, 52, 53, 55, 57, 58, 60, 63-65, 67-83, 87, 88, 92-98, 100, 101, 108-112, 119, 121, 123, 127, 130, 131, 134, 136, 138, 155, 159, 160-162, 164, 166, 167, 173, 174, 177, 181, 190, 193, 194, 200, 203
 Dauksza, Mikołaj: 10, 11
 Diltthey, Wilhelm: 1
 Długosz, Jan: 27-29, 32, 33, 50, 70, 78, 79, 118
 Domowski, Roman: 10
 Donelaitis, Kristijonas: 54
 Dowgird, Tadeusz: 175
 Draper, John: 138
 Droysen, Johann: 1
 Dusburg, Petri von: 26, 79, 89, 97, 100, 131, 157, 176
 Dygasinski, Adolf: 170

 Fichte, Johann Gottlieb: 75
 Fligier, C.: 119
 Fortunatov, Filip: 37
 Fromas-Gužutis, Aleksandras: 90, 141

- Gaidamavičius, Jonas: 170
 Gediminas: 4, 12, 26, 100
 Genzelis, Bronius: 201, 202
 Giedroyć, Józef: 46, 54
 Gintila, Jonas: 94
 Girsztadt: 113
 Grote, George: 131
 Grotius, Hugo: 73
 Grunau, Simon: 97
 Guagnini, Alexander: 29, 56, 118
- Haeckel, Ernst: 131
 Hartknoch, Krzystoff: 88
 Hector: 73
 Hegel, George: 143
 Hellwald, F.: 119
 Henry the Latvian (Henricus de Lettis): 26, 131
 Herbaczewski, Józef Albin: 38
 Herder, Johann Gottfried von: 17, 33, 57, 75, 87
 Herman of Wartberg: 26
 Herodotus: 73, 120, 130
 Hobsbawm, Eric: 196
 Homer: 120
 Hroch, Miroslav: 201, 202
 Hussarzewski, Tomasz: 67
- Innocent IV: 4
 Ivinskis, Zenonas: 199, 202
 Iwiński, Ławryn: 35, 58, 100
- Jablonskis, Jonas: 128, 176, 177
 Jadwiga: 5, 165
 Jankūnas, Danielius: 153
 Jankus, Martynas: 116, 153
 Janulaitis, Augustinas: 177
 Jaroszewicz, Józef: 20, 31, 65, 67, 73, 81, 190
 Jogaila: 4, 5, 18, 26, 33, 39, 69, 98, 130, 132, 134, 140, 153, 164-166, 172
- Jucevičius, Liudvikas (Jucewicz, Ludwik): 26, 34, 46, 47, 53-58, 59, 60, 101, 167
 Jugmann, Josef: 142
- Kapsukas, Vincas (Mickevičius, Vincas): 178-180
 Karamazin, Nikolai: 34, 131
 Kaufman, K.: 109
 Kęstutis: 4, 5, 12, 26, 73, 119
 Kirkor, Adam Honory: 35, 36, 141
 Kojałowicz, Wijuk Albert: 29, 50, 73, 79, 81, 97
 Kołontaj, Hugo: 52
 Kondratowicz, Ludwik: 9, 19, 32, 40, 78, 113
 Kontrym, Kazimierz: 66
 Kościuszko, Tadeusz: 13, 113, 135
 Kossakowski, Jerzy: 12
 Kossarzewski, Ambraziej: 35
 Kossuth, Lajos: 171
 Kotzebue, August von: 34, 73, 131
 Krasicki, Ignacy: 48
 Kraszewski, Ignacy: 9, 14, 19, 32, 33, 34, 38, 46, 54, 55, 59, 65, 69, 75, 78, 82, 112, 113, 117, 119, 123, 126, 141, 143, 162, 164, 165, 167, 168, 175
 Krömer, Marcin: 29, 50, 70, 118
 Kurdirka, Vincas: 39, 168-171, 178
 Kulakauskas, Antanas: 202
 Kulwieć, Abraham: 10
 Kyburg: 126
- Landsbergis, Gabrieilius: 175
 Lasicki, Jan: 89, 176
 Latkauskis, Julius: 157
 Lelewel, Joachim: 12, 25, 31, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 56, 63, 65, 67, 68, 70, 73, 75, 80, 87, 90, 94
 Lenartowicz, Teofil: 113
 Leonas, Petras: 154

- Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim: 33
 Lievin, Anatol: 10
 Limanowski, Bolesław: 37, 38
 Lobjko, Ivan: 48
 Łossowski, Piotr: 200
 Lvov, Vice-governor: 92
- Mably, Bonnot de: 73
 Machiavelli, Nicolo: 73
 Maciūnas, Vincas: 200, 201
 Maironis, Jonas (Mačulis, Jonas):
 158-167, 173
 Mandelbaum, Maurice: 1
 Marburg, Wigand von: 79
 Marx, Karl: 129, 170, 179
 Mašiotas, Pranas: 178
 Matulaitis, Petras: 173, 174
 Matulaitis, Stasys: 178, 181
 Mažydas, Martynas: 10, 52
 Mazzini, Guiseppe: 142
 Meinecke, Friedrich: 1
 Merkys, Vytautas: 202, 203
 Michalo Lituanus: 27
 Mickiewicz, Adam: 9, 10, 12, 13, 19,
 20, 32, 34, 40, 46, 48, 53, 54,
 56, 59, 64, 65, 66, 69, 72, 78,
 82, 87, 88, 113, 117, 126, 130,
 167, 168
 Miechovius, Maciej: 29
 Mielcke, Christian: 88
 Mierzyński, Antoni: 157, 176, 177
 Mikšas, Jurgis: 108, 116
 Mill, John Stuart: 17
 Miłosz, Czesław: 14
 Mindaugas: 4, 100, 130
 Moniuszka, Stanisław: 40
 Müller, Max: 119
 Murav'ev, Mikhail N.: 92, 95, 174
- Narbutt, Teodor: 11, 12, 13, 16, 20,
 25, 26, 31, 34, 40, 46, 51, 56,
 59, 68, 69-72, 75, 79, 81, 87,
 88, 89, 90, 100, 112, 119, 121,
 123, 126, 127, 130, 131, 136,
 162, 167, 175
- Narkiewicz, Józef: 48
 Naruszewicz, Adam: 30, 31, 70, 113
 Nicholas I: 67, 99
 Nicholas II: 178
 Niemcewicz, Julian: 70
 Nieziabitoski, Kajetan: 58, 96
- Ochmański, Jerzy: 200
 Ochorowicz, Julijan: 170
 Odoacer: 79, 80, 130
 Odyniec, Antoni: 244
 Onacewicz, Ignacy: 30, 48, 53, 67,
 68, 69, 70, 79, 87, 126
 Ovid: 48
 O'Connell, Daniel: 143, 171
- Pakalniškis, Kazimieras: 155
 Palemon: 28, 51, 80, 89, 127, 130
 Palačky, František: 142
 Parnell, Charles: 143
 Perkūnas: 79, 90, 132
 Petkiewicz, Jerzy: 97
 Pietaris, Vincas: 139, 140, 177
 Piłsudski, Józef: 11, 38, 64
 Plater, Jerzy: 87
 Pliny: 73
 Poczobutt, Marcin: 66
 Poniatowski, Stanislaus August: 31
 Popiel: 51
 Poška, Dionizas: 46, 47, 48-53, 55,
 56, 60, 79, 88, 89, 193
 Poujoullant, Jean: 138
 Prochaska, Antoni: 154, 157, 164,
 165
 Ptolemy: 73
 Pufendorf, Samuel: 73
- Radziwiłł (Radvila): 15, 65, 70
 Radvila the Black: 81
 Raila, Stanislovas: 114
 Ranke, Leopold von: 2
 Rapegelonis, Stanisław: 10
 Rask, Rasmus: 74, 120
 Rawlinson, Henry Creswicke: 131
 Renan, Ernest: 18, 118

- Rhesa, L.J.: 54
 Riurik: 130
 Römer, Michał: 38, 195, 199, 200, 202
 Rotundus, Augustine: 29
 Rousseau, Jean Jacques: 75, 76
 Ruigys, Paulius: 88

 Šafařík, Pavel: 143
 Šalkauskis, Stasys: 15, 16
 Sauerwein, Georg: 127
 Schelling, Friedrich Wilhelm: 143
 Schleicher, August: 74, 121
 Schliemann, Heinrich: 120, 130
 Siemieński, Lucyan: 55
 Sienkiewicz, Henryk: 27, 140
 Sigismund, Holy Roman Emperor: 165
 Sigismund Augustus: 5, 69, 81
 Skimborwicz, Hipolit: 53
 Skirmuntt, Konstancya: 38, 39, 40, 141
 Šliūpas, Jonas: 108, 111, 112, 115, 116, 117, 124, 128, 129-139, 142, 152, 154, 159, 160, 161, 169, 172, 180
 Šliūpas, Stanislovas: 137
 Słowacki, Juliusz: 32, 78, 168
 Smith, Anthony D.: 8, 9
 Śniadecki, Jan: 66
 Śniadecki, Jędrzej: 66
 Solov'ev, Sergei: 119
 Spencer, Herbert: 137
 Stadnicki, Kazimierz: 175
 Stanevičius, Simonas: 53, 57, 59, 67, 73, 87-90, 101, 102, 176
 Staszic, Stanisław: 52, 67, 154
 Staugaitis, Jonas: 175
 Strabo: 25
 Strazda, Antanas: 47
 Strykowski, Maciej: 13, 28, 29, 30, 33, 50, 56, 73, 79, 80, 81, 89, 90, 97, 112, 118, 131, 160, 162
 Świętochowski, Aleksander: 138, 170

 Tacitus: 3, 25, 73, 74, 80
 Tetzner, Franz: 121
 Thucydides: 120
 Totoraitis, Jonas: 177, 189
 Trumpa, Vincas: 204
 Tumas-Vaižgantas, Juozas: 99, 156, 157, 158
 Tyszkiewicz, Eustach: 34, 35

 Ugenski, Andrzej: 95

 Valančius, Motiejus: 14, 19, 35, 65, 73, 87, 91-102, 109, 112, 124, 127, 152, 158, 167, 174, 176, 190
 Valiūnas, Silvestras: 47
 Vico, Giambattista: 2
 Vileišis, Jonas: 178
 Vileišis, Petras: 140-142
 Virgil: 48
 Višinskis, Povilas: 178, 181
 Vištelis, Andrius: 108
 Voigt, Johann: 73, 100, 131
 Vytautas: 4, 5, 12, 18, 26, 32, 39, 47, 59, 73, 98, 126, 130, 132, 153, 154, 161, 164, 165

 Waga, Teodor: 49
 Waryński, Ludwik: 169
 Watson, Karl F.: 12
 White, Hayden: 29
 Wolff, Józef: 175
 Wolter, Eduard (Volteris, Edwardas): 37
 Wright, William: 120

 Xantho: 131

 Zatorski, Franciszek: 53